CURRENT NEWS EARLY BIRD

THURSDAY, May 21, 1998

House Votes To Ban Export Of Satellites And Missile Technology To China

By Eric Schmitt

WASHINGTON -- In a bipartisan stampede on a politically explosive issue, the House overwhelmingly voted on Wednesday to bar the export of American-made commercial satellites to China.

The two lopsided votes on the issue -- 364 to 54 against satellite exports and 412 to 6 against exports of sensitive technology embedded in satellites -- reflect the widespread fear of Democrats and Republicans that President Clinton's decision to waive export controls on space technology to China allowed Beijing to hone the accuracy of nuclear missiles that could strike American cities.

"If there is an innocent explanation for all this, the American people haven't heard it," Rep. Sue Myrick, R-N.C., said on the House floor on Wednesday.

Administration officials criticized the votes on amendments to a $271 billion Defense Department budget bill as a frenzied response to reports that the Chinese military might have funneled campaign money into Democratic committees in the 1996 presidential campaign. The officials said that if enacted, the measures would prohibit the U.S. satellite industry from using low-cost Chinese launching services.

"If this legislation passes, it will threaten American global leadership in communication and commercial satellite business," said James Rubin, the State Department spokesman.

Officials from major satellite companies, including Loral and the Lockheed Martin Corp., declined to comment on the House votes.

The amendments still need the approval of the Senate, where prospects for passage are unclear. "I don't know whether we'd see the Senate go along with exactly that kind of response," said Sen. Thad Cochran, R-Miss., whose Governmental Affairs subcommittee will examine the missile technology issue at a hearing on Thursday.

As the House debated the amendments, Sen. Trent Lott of Mississippi, the majority leader, announced a multipronged Senate inquiry into the transfer of advanced technology to China. On Tuesday, Speaker Newt Gingrich of Georgia said the House would form a special select committee to investigate the same issues.

But Lott and Sen. Richard Shelby of Alabama, the Intelligence Committee chairman who was named by Lott named to lead the Senate inquiry, implicitly criticized the House approach as taking too long to establish and being too susceptible to partisanship.

"Everybody here knows that the Senate has a bipartisan intelligence committee," Shelby said. "The House is partisan. I think we'll be a lot better off."

Lott said if Clinton follows through with his trip to China next month, it would be a "tragic mistake" for him to open his visit at Tiananmen Square in Beijing, where the Chinese Army crushed pro-democracy demonstrators in 1989.

Lawmakers on both sides of Capitol Hill renewed their calls for the administration to release documents related to the technology transfers that congressional committees have requested in recent weeks.

The White House counsel, Charles F.C. Ruff, on Wednesday promised that the administration would soon begin turning over to Congress documents about the Chinese launching of American satellites.

Earlier this month Lott and Gingrich complained to the president about they said was a "veil of secrecy" that the administration had erected around congressional efforts to look into the case of space expertise provided to China in 1996 by executives from Loral Space & Communication and the Hughes Electronics Corp., a subsidiary of General Motors.

What happened in 1996 is now the subject of a criminal investigation by the Justice Department. Ruff cautioned in a letter to Lott that the depart-

ment would be consulted before any documents were turned over to Congress.

So far the department has blocked the Pentagon from releasing a classified report it did last year that found that the help the Chinese received in 1996 harmed the national security of the United States by advancing China's missile capabilities, according to administration officials. Hughes and Loral have denied any wrongdoing.

In the debate on the House floor Wednesday, Republicans were gleeful at finding a weighty issue to use against Clinton that was easily understood and that resonated with the American public.

"This is not a political issue, this is a national security issue," said Rep. Dana Rohrabacher, R-Calif.

Democrats who had staunchly defended the White House from Republican attacks on campaign finance practices and on the president's relationship with a White House intern on Wednesday fled for political cover by supporting the Republican amendments in droves.

"The politics of this is pretty overwhelming," conceded Rep. Lee Hamilton of Indiana, one of a handful of Democrats who voted against both amendments. "No one wants to strengthen Chinese missile capability."

Hamilton said despite the amendments' popular appeal, each had particular problems.

American companies export commercial satellites to foreign countries because it is cheaper to launch them into orbit there than it is from the United States. China's rates for commercial launches -- $20 million to $25 million per launch -- are among the cheapest in the world, satellite specialists say.

Besides the measures barring the export of missile and satellite technology, including the launching of commercial satellites in China, the House also approved, by a vote of 414 to 7, an amendment prohibiting American participation in any investigations into failed launches of American satellites by Chinese rockets unless specially trained monitors from the Pentagon or State Department acted as chaperones.

The Justice Department is investigating whether sensitive technological information was passed to the Chinese during American industry reviews of an accidental explosion of a Chinese rocket moments after it was launched in February 1996.

The criminal inquiry is focused on whether officials from Loral and other companies who joined in the review violated American export control laws. Loral said this week that no secret or sensitive information was conveyed to the Chinese. But a Pentagon study concluded that American security was jeopardized.

Republicans remained unpersuaded by the satellite industry's denials of sharing information. "Loral and Hughes, to make their stockholders happy, had to figure out how to make the missiles more reliable," said Rep. Duncan Hunter, R-Calif.

The House also approved a nonbinding resolution urging Clinton not to enter into any new agreements with China on satellite or missile technology. "As he prepares for the summit, President Clinton should leave the bag of carrots at home," said Rep. Benjamin Gilman, R-N.Y., who heads the House International Security Committee.

In addition, Republicans focused on whether the administration's decision in 1996 to move control over export licensing to the Commerce Department from the State Department helped China develop more reliable and accurate rockets.

The Pentagon and State Department objected to the policy shift. The technology needed to put a commercial satellite in orbit is similar to the technology that guides a long-range nuclear missile to its target.

Republicans evoked some cold war images, repeatedly referring to "Communist China" to underscore their concern that ordinary citizens had been endangered by a policy shift in Washington. "Something terrible has happened, and every man, woman and child may well have been jeopardized," Rohrabacher said.

For the most part, Democrats offered only a token defense.

"The tenor of these amendments is to make policy judgments before we have all the facts," said Rep. Ike Skelton of Missouri, the ranking Democrat on the House National Security Committee.

Republicans tried to stick to the theme that the administration's actions may have jeopardized national security, and occasionally they pushed that theme to its limits.

"My colleagues on the other side need to be patriots first and politicians second," said Rep. Dan Burton, R-Ind., who earlier in the debate on Wednesday raised the question of whether Clinton's waiver was "treasonous." (Burton said he hoped not.)

Democrats pounced on Burton's remarks as evidence that partisan politics, in the guise of concern over the affairs of state, was motivating Republicans.

"We may have liberals, moderates and conservatives, but I'll tell you one thing, we have patriots on this side," snapped Rep. Norman Sisisky, D-Va. "Let's keep this debate on the high level."

Wall Street Journal May 21, 1998 Pg. 1

America Learns To Play World Cop As No One Else Is Willing Or Able

By Thomas E. Ricks and Carla Anne Robbins, Staff Reporters of the Wall Street Journal

OUTPOST 53 ALPHA, Macedonia -- As much as any place on earth, this rainswept bunker commanded by Sgt. 1st Class Robert Canarios captures the U.S. role in the post-Cold War world.

Sgt. Canarios is glad he is on this sandbagged hilltop in Macedonia, keeping the troubles in nearby Kosovo from spilling southward. There is no fighting here, where his "presence mission" consists mainly of unarmed patrols through border villages. But the 32-year-old platoon sergeant figures there would be violence if the Serbs didn't know that he and 367 other U.S. Army troops are in the neighborhood. Sgt. Canarios also is glad he fought in the Persian Gulf War and proud he served in the Sinai Desert, Somalia and Bosnia.

But now the 13-year veteran is planning to get out of the Army, though he is only seven years away from full retirement. "With all these pockets of instability in the world, is it our responsibility to be big brother every time there's a problem?" he asks, looking out over the Serb border. Unfortunately, he thinks, the answer is yes. He just doesn't want to be the one to do it anymore.

Can't Do Without U.S.

Nearly a decade after the

Soviet Union unraveled, no single dominant threat has emerged to define clearly America's role in the world. But there remains an organizing principle to the way the world works: If anything is going to get done, the U.S. is going to have to do it. The U.S. is, as Secretary of State Madeleine Albright likes to say, "the indispensable nation."

It isn't an easy role. Consider the list of crises suddenly clamoring for strong U.S. leadership: surprise nuclear testing in India, financial and political chaos in Indonesia, stalemated Middle East peace negotiations, a brewing civil war in Kosovo. Just yesterday, it fell to Ms. Albright to nudge Indonesian President Suharto to step aside when she declared in a speech that he faces "an opportunity for an historic act of statesmanship" by allowing a transition to democracy. Add to these hot spots America's front-line military responsibilities: 70,000 U.S. troops deployed just to hold off rogues in North Korea and Iraq, and an additional 8,500 in Bosnia.

Nearly as striking is how little America's allies are willing to get involved. President Clinton spent most of last weekend at a summit meeting, badgering leaders of the world's other rich democracies into punishing India, and got strong words but no multilateral sanctions. The Clinton administration also has failed to persuade or bully its allies to take tougher action in Iraq or Kosovo. And this week, the White House was forced by European resistance to back away from sanctions on foreign companies investing in Iran, which the U.S. insists is a terrorist state. Increasingly, the choice for the U.S. is to act alone or do nothing.

A Tough Assignment

For all of America's indispensability these days, it isn't clear that the country really wants or is ready for the job. For one thing, the role is beginning to strain America's shrunken military, raising in the Pentagon concerns of a kind of imperial overreach. And can any country really solve the world's problems alone?

"The U.S., by itself, can take on pretty much any military threat you can imagine," says John Chipman, director of the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies. "But the U.S. cannot run a sanctions program by itself." Many threats, from financial turmoil in Asia to weapons proliferation and even to containing Iraq's Saddam Hussein, require at least as much multinational diplomatic and economic pressure as they do the threat or use of military force.

The broader problem is that, like Sgt. Canarios in Macedonia, the Clinton administration, Congress and the American public are deeply divided about the U.S. role in the world. Asked about America's indispensability, even Ms. Albright, the most tough-minded of the Clinton team, is quick to offer caveats: "It has as much to do with the indispensable power of our example as it does plain old power... . It does not mean that we are the world's policeman." Congress has voiced bipartisan doubts about American leadership, refusing to ante up $1 billion in back dues to the United Nations and $18 billion in new funds for the International Monetary Fund.

Americans generally haven't proved as isolationist as many feared, but are uninterested and "disengaged," says Andrew Kohut of the Pew Research Center, a public-polling organization. He says President Clinton has been able to use the public's disengagement to his advantage, sending troops to Haiti and Bosnia without any political backlash or even any serious political discussion. The bad news, he warns, is that "should any mission turn bad, the response could be hugely negative." That was exactly what happened with the U.S. mission in Somalia.

Wishy-Washy

America's ambivalence hasn't been lost on either its allies or its enemies. "You can see a common thread of U.S. weakness in all these crises," argues Robert Kagan of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "The U.S.'s evident unwillingness to use force against Saddam sent a signal to [Yugoslav President Slobodan] Milosevic that we wouldn't try to use force against him. I don't apologize for India. But India clearly saw a flagging U.S. effort to contain Chinese proliferation that led them to believe that the U.S. would not be able to sustain a sanctions policy if they went ahead with these tests."

Paradoxically, America's international commitments today are substantially smaller than during the Cold War. In 1987, the U.S. had 524,000 personnel stationed overseas, more than twice the current number, even with a pending crisis in the Persian Gulf. American foreign-aid spending in 1985 was more than twice last year's commitment in inflation-adjusted terms.

What makes a lighter burden seem so onerous is that few Americans expected the world to turn out the way it has. Many expected a more peaceful and stable world; what they got is continual turmoil. And how many Americans anticipated that the end of the Cold War meant that America would expand, rather than shrink, its obligations to defend Europe by enlarging the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

There also were strong expectations that whatever midlevel threats might arise, America's middle-power allies would shoulder some of the burden. That hope evaporated when the Europeans proved unable to resolve Bosnia's problems. It is a failure from which they have yet to recover. Rep. Gene Taylor, a Mississippi Democrat, recalls a meeting in Bosnia last fall with three European generals-one British, one French, one Italian. "They're proud people, but you know what they told me?" he asks. "They couldn't do it [by themselves]. They sat there, in uniform, looking across the table from me, saying, 'Only America could make it happen.' " Rep. Taylor flew to Bosnia a determined opponent of the U.S. mission there; he came home a true believer in it.

Though the Clinton administration often tries to look beyond immediate American security or financial gain in setting policy, it hasn't learned how to sell or impose its longer-term view abroad or at home. In fact, the level of public disengagement, and President Clinton's difficulty in challenging it, has limited America's ability to solve problems.

Remember Haiti?

The cost has been striking in Haiti, where the U.S. occupation had three rules: take no casualties, spend very little cash, and get out fast. Nearly four years later, Haiti's right-wing thugs have all but disappeared. But the suffering and poverty haven't, and Haiti's democracy is paralyzed. (More than 200 Army personnel remain stationed in Haiti to provide civil assistance.)

The U.S. is doing better in Bosnia. After 18 months of timidity, the U.S.-led coalition is taking more risks, tracking down at least midlevel war criminals and announcing that it will stay for the duration. But all progress could be for naught if the civil war in Kosovo explodes.

A different kind of threat has emerged in Asia, where a financial crisis is showing how a nonmilitary threat can damage American interests. It is also an example of the limits of unilateral power. Without something like the IMF's safety net and the leverage that comes with the promise of cash, the damaged economies of Thailand and South Korea could have collapsed.

One problem, many people think, is that the Asian crisis has stretched the Fund's resources to the limit. Having pledged $34.7 billion to Korea, Indonesia and Thailand, it has only $37 billion left to meet future emergencies in the developing world. If the U.S. commits an additional $18 billion, other Fund members would make proportional contributions. If the U.S. doesn't act, however, no one else will either, creating the prospect of even more financial panic in Asia and around the world.

The current nuclear crisis with India and Pakistan is another example of the inability of any one country, even the U.S., to address all post-Cold War dangers on its own. Whether a united front of economic sanctions by the Group of Eight industrialized nations would be enough to prod India's new nationalist government to abandon its nuclear ambitions isn't certain. What is certain, however, is that America's failure to bring along allies such as Russia, France

and even Britain will send a message to India, Pakistan and other nuclear aspirants that they can act without fear of major repercussions.

At the end of the day, a good part of American leadership comes down to the basic fact that the U.S. is the only nation with a truly global military force. Yet that strength now appears to be at risk. In just seven years, the U.S. military has gone from triumphant victory in the Persian Gulf to quiet concern about overstretch.

'Signs of Some Erosion'

In e-mails and in Pentagon hallways, officers trade horror stories about readiness problems. Entire divisions are undermanned. More and more aircraft are grounded for spare parts. Training hours are being cut back. Green soldiers are being rushed from boot camp to missions such as Macedonia to replace those bailing out. (The majority of the troops in Sgt. Canarios's platoon have been in the Army less than a year.) The Air Force currently projects that within three years, it will be short 1,800 pilots. Even Defense Secretary William Cohen concedes, "We are starting to see signs of some erosion, certainly on the edges of things."

What isn't generally recognized is how different today's military is from the force of just a decade ago. The active-duty military is one-third smaller than it was at its recent peak in 1987 of 2.2 million.

Yet as Sgt. Canarios complained, that smaller force is far busier than the military of a decade ago. During the 40 years of the Cold War, the U.S. military executed 10 major deployments. Since the Cold War ended, it has done 27, including Somalia, Rwanda and northern Iraq. And that doesn't include dozens of minor forays. Almost no one in the U.S. noticed in January when 59 Marines and other service members were deployed to feed hungry Kenyans marooned by El Nino floods.

The nature of the new missions also is straining the force in unforeseen ways. The U.S. military of today is all-volunteer, which makes it older and twice as likely to be married as was the conscript-heavy force of the early Cold War. That maturity makes it more disciplined and professional. But a force that is married also soon begins to yearn for its families, especially after two or three deployments in open-ended missions such as Bosnia, Macedonia and the Persian Gulf.

Losing the Edge

The emerging wisdom in the Army is that one peacekeeping mission may be good for a soldier, expanding his horizons, but that more than one dulls his fighting prowess. When Sgt. Canarios's 1st Infantry Division, the famed "Big Red One," got out of Bosnia in April last year, it went home to Germany-and then went to a remote post for weeks of intensive training to restore combat skills. One-third of the U.S. soldiers now in Macedonia have served in Bosnia.

Recently, a somber resignation letter from Lt. Daniel Ullman, an officer in the 1st Armored Division, has been making the rounds among Army officers. "I do not enjoy peacekeeping," the six-year veteran wrote. "It is far too political. I didn't join the Army to be a peacekeeper."

Throughout the 1990s, the Pentagon has robbed the modernization account to pay the bill for operations in Bosnia and around Iraq, which together have cost more than $11 billion since the end of the Gulf War. But tanks, trucks and other gear bought during the Reagan buildup are beginning to wear out, so the Pentagon is trying to find more money for modernization. The fastest way to do that is to cut personnel-but cutting troops would put an even greater burden on those who remain.

What is to be done? Defense analysts see three possible solutions: Increase the defense budget, reduce the number of overseas missions, or reshape the force. The first appears unlikely for domestic political reasons. The second appears unlikely for international-security reasons. And the third is difficult, especially for an institution already stressed by shrinking and by taking on new jobs.

In the long run, the U.S. military is likely to be reshaped as more "expeditionary"-able to move quickly to any spot in the world and conduct combat or relief operations. But doing that well requires lots of money and strong interest from Congress and the White House. The military currently lacks both.

Lessons in Grace

On the diplomatic and economic fronts, the changes required are more political and psychological.

If the new American role is to be sustained, analysts say, President Clinton and his successor will need to start making the case for it. The U.S. will also have to be wary of issuing ultimatums and threats of sanctions it can't enforce. Many analysts argue that the U.S. will also have to learn to share power more graciously, nurturing allies that will take on a share of the burden. "We have to learn to let go somewhat," argues Charles Wolf Jr. of the Rand Corp., a think tank.

None of this is an argument for American retreat. Even if the U.S. wanted out, the rest of the world isn't likely to let it go easily. A few dozen miles northwest of Outpost 53 Alpha, ethnic Albanian demonstrators in Kosovo plead for NATO intervention, waving American flags and signs written in English. They know who's watching CNN.

The U.S. can shrug off some of the appeals, but it can't make a habit of it, argues Carnegie's Mr. Kagan. "If we're not shaping the world," he says, "there are other, more dangerous people who'd like to step in and take our place."

New York Times May 21, 1998 Pg. 1

Suharto Steps Down After 32 Years In Power

By Seth Mydans

JAKARTA, Indonesia -- President Suharto apologized Thursday for his mistakes and resigned after 32 years in power, handing office to his vice president, B.J. Habibie, in a nationally televised ceremony. After his brief statement of resignation, he turned the microphone toward Habibie, who immediately took the oath of office as a justice held the Koran above Habibie's head.

Suharto then stepped up, shook his hand, smiled and walked down a line of judges, smiling and shaking their hands. He gave a small salute in the direction of onlookers and walked away. The justices then filed past Habibie and shook his hand.

The entire procedure took less than 10 minutes.

Defense Minister Wiranto stepped to the microphone and said that the military "supports and welcomes the resignation of President Suharto," and pledged his support to Habibie. He also said that the military would guarantee the safety of Suharto's family.

Under the headline "Nation Awaits New Government," the daily Jakarta Post reported "a flurry of activity" during the night at the president's residence and said the defense secretary and armed forces commander, Wiranto, had met with the top military brass. Tanks and soldiers took up positions on the streets of Jakarta on Thursday morning.

Pressure on Suharto, 76, to resign had been steadily rising. Asia's longest-serving ruler after 32 years in power, and a political master, he nevertheless failed to comprehend the intensity of his people's discontent.

U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright on Wednesday all but called openly for his resignation, and Stanley Fisher, deputy chief of the International Monetary Fund, warned that no more aid would be sent to Indonesia as long as Suharto remained in office.

Eleven of Suharto's Cabinet members who handle economic policy resigned, and the speaker of Parliament, Harmoko, said he would initiate impeachment proceedings on Monday.

The Parliament building remained occupied by members of a nationwide student movement that galvanized this politically passive country of more than 200 million only two

months after Suharto engineered his ritual re-election to a seventh five-year term.

Their protests set off three days of widely destructive rioting in Jakarta last week that caused at least 500 deaths and shocked the nation into a final consensus that Suharto must go.

But it is not clear that the public will accept his replacement by Habibie, 61, a crony who is unpopular with the politically powerful military and whose nomination as vice president earlier this year caused the Indonesian currency, the rupiah, to fall to its lowest level yet.

Students who have occupied Parliament for three days demanding Suharto's removal said in a number of interviews that they would not accept Habibie as his successor.

Under the Constitution, Habibie would serve out Suharto's term, which ends in 2003. But if he showed himself to be inadequate to the job, he could be removed by a special session of an electoral assembly. Habibie has little political base of his own, owing his position entirely to his close friendship with Suharto, and a number of political analysts have said they expect a power struggle if he succeeds the president.

The tasks facing any new president are daunting. The economy is in free fall, with political unrest and months of rioting exacerbating an eight-month economic crisis that has brought inflation, rising prices, food shortages, bankruptcies and paralysis to the banking system.

Foreign businesses have fled the country, and investors have turned away. The currency is now worth less than 20 percent of its value last summer. Little has been done to carry out a $43 billion rescue package organized in October by the International Monetary Fund.

"The country needs to take some very tough economic steps that even a popular president would have difficulty implementing," a Western diplomat said. "For an unpopular president this will be almost impossible."

In 48 years as an independent country, Indonesia has never known a smooth transition of power. In 1965 Suharto, then a top general, took control of the country after helping suppress what he said was a communist coup attempt against the country's founding president, Sukarno.

An anti-communist purge followed in which as many as 500,000 people were killed. It was two more years before Suharto allowed the elections he had promised, and by that time he had taken firm control of the country, using the military as his power base.

There are ambitious generals in the military today as well, and they will again have the last word in any power struggle. Apart from Suharto's own circle, there is virtually no other center of power.

The opposition movement was remarkable in that it was leaderless. Though in the end virtually the entire nation turned against him, Suharto was so successful in co-opting public figures and in neutralizing the opposition that the democracy movement remained ineffectual.

For a time the most prominent name among the opposition was Megawati Sukarnoputri, the daughter of Sukarno. But as public discontent grew, she remained passive. A popular Muslim leader, Amien Rais, emerged in recent weeks as a spokesman for the opposition, but public support had not yet coalesced around him.

Like the late President Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines, Suharto was pushed toward giving up his office when he lost the support of one sector of society and politics after another.

As Indonesia's crisis intensified since the start of the year, a fledgling middle-class opposition movement began to emerge. In recent days, small groups of businessmen and lawyers staged demonstrations in support of the students.

It was when his obedient Parliament turned against him this week that it became clear that Suharto would not last long.

Welcoming the students who occupied its building and broad courtyard, Parliament -- packed with Suharto's supporters -- shocked the nation this week by calling for him to step down.

As extraordinary as the student occupation of Indonesia's seat of government was the spectacle of the formerly powerless legislature rising to confront the man who has controlled its actions for three decades. Rather than "people power," it was a display of rubber-stamp-Parliament power that shook the foundations of his rule.

Initially, the military blocked the parliamentary leaders' move, saying it remained loyal to the president. But the legislators persisted. On Wednesday they announced that they would call a special session of the electoral commission on Monday to reverse its 2-month-old presidential vote and impeach Suharto.

In a surreal scene, the legislators worked Thursday in hushed offices on the upper floors of the building while thousands of rowdy, cheering student demonstrators filled its halls and courtyard.

The students hung a huge, misspelled sign on the from the building's upper floors, proclaiming in English: "Suharto and crownies go to hell."

They shredded government documents and flung them as confetti from windows. They pranced on the building's broad, curved roof. As students lounging in gold brocade armchairs jeered government officials who appeared on a large-screen television set, the legislators worked in their offices down the hall to prepare their risky challenge to the president.

One last straw was a vote Thursday by the president's own party, Golkar, to support the move against him. One of the legislators, Muhamad Asad Umar, said it was not a difficult decision. "The situation did not allow him to stay on," he said.

Asked whether he felt sorry for the man who had engaged his loyalty for so long, Umar said, "I have felt sorry for him for years, but he didn't take the hint."

Washington Post May 21, 1998 Pg. 1

Clinton Calls for Germ War Antidotes

By Bradley Graham
Washington Post
Staff Writer

President Clinton has decided to order the stockpiling of vaccines and antibiotics to treat massive numbers of civilians in the event of an attack against the United States using biological weapons, according to sources familiar with the plan.

While the Pentagon already has accumulated some medicines to shield American troops from a handful of germ warfare agents, no similar reserves exist for civilians.

The prospect that an enemy state or terrorist group might unleash a deadly pathogen or toxin, capable of killing tens of thousands of people in a U.S. city, has become an increasing concern among national security specialists. Although experts differ on the near-term likelihood of such a threat, Clinton's order is the latest and most ambitious of several recent administration initiatives to improve the way military and civilian authorities cope with domestic attacks through a latter-day civil defense.

Clinton's personal interest in the subject is said by aides to have deepened in recent weeks, spurred by books and briefings. After listening in early April to an outside panel of seven specialists discuss the poor condition of U.S. biological and chemical defenses, Clinton sought the group's recommendations on how to deal with a biological attack. In a subsequent 16-page report, the panel urged Clinton to begin the stockpile program and take other steps to strengthen the ability of the nation's public health system to respond rapidly.

Details about how fast to build the stockpiles and how to pay for them are still being discussed by senior administration officials. Plans call for Clinton to announce the initiative during a commencement address tomorrow at the Naval

Academy in Annapolis that will focus on the administration's stepped-up efforts to combat terrorism of various kinds.

Establishing stockpiles for dozens of U.S. cities could easily cost billions of dollars and require years before adequate levels are reached, according to experts. A Pentagon program to develop and produce as many as 18 new vaccines to protect U.S. military forces during wartime was initiated last year at an estimated cost of $320 million over five years. A civilian stockpile program would cover a much larger population and require millions more doses.

It also would require scientific innovations. Anthrax is the only potential germ weapon for which a vaccine has been licensed by the Food and Drug Administration and is being produced in the United States. Other vaccines are under development but have yet to prove safe for human use. While it is unclear whether the administration is discussing inoculations for civilians as a preventive measure, vaccines might be used in case of an impending war or in uncontaminated communities in the event of attacks elsewhere in the country.

A group of outside specialists, also commissioned by the administration but separate from the one that briefed Clinton, has listed five agents that present the most immediate menace -- anthrax, smallpox, plague, tuleremia and botulinum toxin.

"Having a national stockpile is an extremely important adjunct to any preparedness program for any city, because no city could possibly stockpile the vaccines and antibiotics necessary to deal with a bioterrorist incident," said Jerry Hauer, the director of New York City's office of emergency management and one of those who advised Clinton on the plan. "It's simply impractical and not financially feasible for many cities."

The stockpile idea is not new. Frank Young, who headed the group that briefed Clinton and formerly directed the Department of Health and Human Services' emergency preparedness office, said the department had comprehensive plans for stockpiles. But the plans took a backseat in recent years to other national health needs considered more pressing.

Some administration officials outside the White House expressed surprise at how fast the president and his National Security Council staff had moved on the initiative this month, noting with some concern that it had not gone through the customary deliberative planning process. Even members of the advisory panel cautioned that stockpiling was just a part of what needed to be a more systematic approach to bolstering U.S. preparedness, which would include greater physician education about coping with a biological attack and more drug and medical research.

Recent defense studies have warned of an increased risk of biological or chemical attack, citing the spread of information about how to produce and deliver poisonous agents and efforts by hostile states and terrorist groups to find less conventional means to challenge the United States. While attention this year has focused on Iraqi efforts to build an anthrax arsenal, as many as 10 countries are said by U.S. officials to have at least the capability to load spores of anthrax into weapons.

In response, the Pentagon has taken steps in the past year to increase funding for better protective gear, improved detectors and new vaccines. In December, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen announced plans to vaccinate all U.S. military personnel against anthrax, marking the first time that American troops will receive routine inoculations against a germ warfare agent.

To bolster defenses on the home front, the Pentagon is also helping to train police, fire, medical and other "first responders" in 120 cities over the next five years.

The FBI has reported only one case in the United States in which a group used biological agents -- a 1984 Oregon incident in which the Rajneeshee, a religious cult, spread salmonella bacteria over food in an effort to make voters sick and influence a county election.

Staff writer John Harris contributed to this report.

New York Times May 21, 1998

House Approves Segregation Of Sexes During Military Training

By Steven Lee Myers

WASHINGTON -- The House cleared the way on Wednesday for legislation that would segregate male and female recruits in the Army, Navy and Air Force during much of basic training, setting the stage for a new legislative fight over the role of women in the military.

The House moved ahead with the legislation despite the objections of many of the nation's military commanders, who have repeatedly warned that separating recruits by sex in the armed forces would undercut their training.

The House's action also put it at odds with the Clinton administration and Secretary of Defense William Cohen. Just two months ago, Cohen rejected a special panel's recommendations to do more to separate recruits -- only to have the House, led by conservatives opposed to the ever-expanding role of women in the military, write the recommendations into legislation.

Although women make up more than 14 percent of the nation's 1.4 million members of the armed forces, integrating recruits in basic training is still relatively new. And the matter has become the subject of a fierce debate on Capitol Hill, fueled by the sex scandals that have buffeted the military in the last year.

The House did not vote directly on the legislation Wednesday, but in a largely procedural vote it blocked any amendments on the issue; some members were trying to attach such amendments to the Defense Department's $270 billion budget bill. Under House rules, the vote, 304 to 108, effectively assures passage of the legislation segregating the sexes when the House votes on the larger budget bill, possibly as soon as Thursday.

That will keep the issue in the forefront of congressional debate for most of the summer. The focus now shifts to the Senate, where there is significantly less support for separating the sexes.

The Army started integrating men and women in most basic training units -- excluding combat divisions -- in 1993 after an abortive attempt that began in the late 1970s. The Navy began in 1994, while the Air Force has been training its recruits together since 1976. Only the Marine Corps, the smallest of the four armed services, separates men and women while training its recruits on Parris Island, South Carolina.

An amendment introduced by Rep. Tillie Fowler, R.-Fla., would have postponed any legislation segregating the sexes in the military at least until a committee appointed by Congress -- at a cost of $2.2 million a year -- completed its findings some time next year.

That committee, whose members are appointed by the House and the Senate, has gotten off to a slow start. Although the panel was mandated by law last year, it has met only twice so far, bogged down by ideological infighting.

The legislation's supporters maintain that separating recruits would avoid distractions that arise when young men and women are forced together during the intense rigors of basic training.

Rep. Steve Buyer, R-Ind., said the legislation largely mirrored what he called the "common sense" recommendations made by Cohen's panel, which was led by Nancy Kassebaum Baker, the former Republican senator from Kansas.

He said men and women would still train together, just not at the most basic unit level: the platoon in the Army, the division in the Navy and the flight in the Air Force. The legislation would also require the armed services to house

recruits in separate barracks, not separate parts of the same building, as is often the case now.

Although Cohen ordered changes in basic training, he dismissed those recommendations, citing the views of the service chiefs.

Buyer dismissed the opposition of the generals and admirals, saying they supported Clinton administration policies in public but opposed them in private. "They're unwilling to step forward to lay their career on the lines to say otherwise," the congressman said.

European Stars & Stripes May 21, 1998 Pg. 3

Cohen Heading To S. America For First Time

WASHINGTON (AP) — Defense Secretary William Cohen makes his first visit to South America next week as Pentagon chief, traveling to Argentina, Chile and Brazil, the Pentagon announced Tuesday.

While meeting with military and civilian officials, Cohen intends to "emphasize U.S. relationships with the region" amid the spread of democracy in the hemisphere, a statement said. He may discuss the possibility of Chile purchasing U.S. fighter jets, but "this is not an arms merchant trip," a Pentagon official said.

Washington Times May 21, 1998 Pg. 1

Pentagon official says he leaked Tripp file

Chief spokesman knew privacy issue

By Bill Sammon
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The Pentagon's chief spokesman has acknowledged under oath that he leaked Linda R. Tripp's personnel file to a reporter even though he knew he might be breaking the law.

Mrs. Tripp is a central figure in the Monica Lewinsky sex-and-lies scandal now embroiling the White House.

Assistant Defense Secretary Kenneth H. Bacon, a Clinton appointee, said Friday in a deposition to Judicial Watch, a conservative legal foundation, that he orchestrated the release of information on whether Mrs. Tripp had ever been arrested.

Such a disclosure is a clear violation of the Privacy Act, according to lawyers familiar with the law. Violating the act is a misdemeanor that rarely nets the offender prison time but often leads to substantial civil fines and severe administrative penalties, such as firing.

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen has already ordered the Pentagon inspector general to investigate the leak of the Tripp information to Jane Mayer, a reporter for the New Yorker magazine who once worked with Mr. Bacon at the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Cohen's office had no comment yesterday when asked about Mr. Bacon's sworn statement.

Previously, Mr. Cohen said Mrs. Tripp's file "was supposed to be protected by the privacy rules" and called its release "certainly inappropriate, if not illegal."

Mr. Bacon refused comment yesterday. He remains chief spokesman for the Pentagon — a fact that rankles some who remember President-elect Clinton's accusation in 1992 that Bush administration officials had rifled through his passport file.

At the time, Mr. Clinton promised if there were similar activities in his administration, "you will not have an inquiry or rigmarole or anything else. If I catch anyone using the State Department like that when I'm president, I'll fire them the next day."

Mr. Bacon received the request from Mrs. Mayer on March 12.

"She called me and said that she had information that Linda Tripp had been arrested," Mr. Bacon said. "She said, 'Is there any way of finding out how she answered a specific question on her security clearance form?' "

Mrs. Mayer explained that Mrs. Tripp had been detained by police as a teen-ager in 1969. She wanted to know whether Mrs. Tripp had answered "no" to the question of whether she had ever been arrested on the clearance form.

"I told her that I would check, but I didn't know whether we would be able to locate the information and, if we could find it, whether we would be able to make it public," Mr. Bacon said. "And I cited the Privacy Act."

Mr. Bacon said he repeated his concerns about privacy when he called David O. Cooke, the Pentagon's director of administration and management, to relay Mrs. Mayer's request. He said he mentioned privacy a third time when he handed off the matter to his principal deputy, Clifford H. Bernath.

On the morning of March 13, Mr. Bernath called Mrs. Mayer to assure her that he was working on the request. He told her, "Ken has made clear it's a priority," according to his notes, which were subpoenaed by Judicial Watch.

But getting the information was not easy. Mr. Cooke referred Mr. Bernath to Steve O'Toole, director of personnel security. Mr. O'Toole, in turn, referred him to Les Blake, chief of the office on Privacy and the Freedom of Information Act.

"I called Mr. Bernath and informed him I had the information he was looking for and ask[ed] him if he was requesting this information in an official capacity," Mr. Blake wrote in a "Memorandum for the Record." "Mr. Bernath assured me that this was an official request."

Mr. Blake then gave Mr. Bernath the security form, which Mrs. Tripp had filled out in 1987. On it, she answered "no" to the question: "Have you ever been arrested, charged, cited or held by law enforcement authorities?"

Mr. Bernath passed this on to Mrs. Mayer, even though no one at the Pentagon had obtained Mrs. Tripp's permission to disclose the information.

"I was certainly aware that he was doing it and did nothing to stop it," Mr. Bacon said. "Cliff and I had discussed this, and this was something we had done together."

Mrs. Mayer used the information to question Mrs. Tripp's credibility in an article that was completed and faxed to Mr. Bacon on Friday night. Mr. Bacon mentioned the article to Mr. Cohen as he prepared for an appearance on a Sunday morning TV talk show.

"I said that the New Yorker magazine was preparing to report that Linda Tripp had lied on a security form and that he could get asked about this on Sunday," Mr. Bacon said.

However, Mr. Bacon said he did not tell Mr. Cohen that the contents

of Mrs. Tripp's Pentagon file had been leaked to the reporter. That omission proved troublesome on March 17, when Mr. Cohen was blindsided by a question about the leak during an appearance at the National Press Club.

By this time, it was clear that Mrs. Tripp had been arrested in a teen-age prank gone awry. Attention shifted away from the substance of her personnel file to the decision to disclose it in the first place.

Mr. Bacon acknowledged in his deposition that his boss was made to look foolish at the Press Club. On March 18, he heard from Mr. Cohen's chief of staff, Robert S. Tyrer.

"He called me and said that he was upset by the fact that information had been released and that Defense Department officials were apparently responsible for it," Mr. Bacon said. "He did not blame me."

Later that day, Mr. Bernath told Mr. Bacon he was calling for a legal review of the disclosure. He has said he was following Mr. Bacon's orders in leaking the Tripp information. He has since been transferred to another Pentagon job.

New York Times May 21, 1998

Filling Power Vacuum: Will Army Rule?

By Nicholas D. Kristof

JAKARTA, Indonesia -- When President Suharto announced his resignation this morning, perhaps the fundamental question looming over the nation and the entire region is who will hold the reins of power that he says he is giving up.

Will Suharto really relinquish power, or does he intend to control the nation from behind the scenes, through the new president, B.J. Habibie, his long-time protégé and associate?

Or will history repeat itself, and will a general take power, in much the way that Suharto wrested power from President Sukarno 32 years ago?

Until now, the armed forces have been the dominant and most cohesive power in the country, as personified by Suharto, a former general. It is striking that nothing was said this morning's annoucnements about new elections, leaving the larger question of whether Indonesia will continue with the power arrangement that Suharto bequeathed, without Suharto. It was also unclear whether the military has cut deals with the outgoing President or the new one; and whether the military is of one view on how the transition should proceed.

Most broadly, perhaps, will Habibie and the Army be able to retain control of a nation now that the passions of a incipient people's power movement have managed to topple Asia's most durable leader?

For now a tense confrontation may still loom ahead. Suharto, backed

by the Army leader, said that Habibie would fill out the remainder of the presidential term and serve until 2003. Protesters interviewed on the street before the handover said that would be absolutely unacceptable and that they would continue to demonstrate if that happened.

Gen. Wiranto, the Defense Minister and armed forces chief, warned the public to accept the change and avoid unrest.

"The army will continue to play an active role to prevent manipulation

and avoid developments that could threaten this nation," General Wiranto said.

For decades President Suharto has barred any significant opposition, yet in a strange and perverse way he may have unintentionally created powerful forces for democracy that will forever change this country, and perhaps Asia as well.

Suharto so antagonized his people that he forced them to rise up and force him from office, and now that they have tasted power they be as unwilling to relinquish it as he was.

The result is that when Suharto announced this morning that he was stepping down from the presidency, he may have handed over supreme power not so much to his Vice President as to the Indonesian people. The transition, in short, may well be not just from one leader to another, but from one system to another: from an authoritarian quasi-kingdom to a more pluralistic democracy.

Yet that remains to be worked out, and a tense confrontation may still loom ahead. Suharto said this morning that his Vice President, his long-time friend and associate, Habibie, would fill out the remainder of the presidential term and serve until the year 2003. Protesters interviewed on the street before the handover said that would be absolutely unacceptable and that they would continue to demonstrate if that happened.

General Wiranto, the defense minister and armed forces chief, warned the public to accept the change and avoid unrest, suggesting that the stand-off may continue.

"The army will continue to play an active role to prevent manipulation and avoid developments that could threaten this nation," General Wiranto said.

Yet Suharto's determined refusal in recent months to retire has created major legacies that will enormously complicate rule by Habibie and the generals: Suharto's intransigence has mobilized students and even part of the middle class into a political force, has nurtured the rise of newspapers that no longer blindly take orders from the presidential palace, and above all has bequeathed a people who are less afraid of the Government than it is of them.

Within Indonesia, the result is likely to be a tussle for control of the country. Suharto may have agreed to resign in the belief that Habibie and the generals will guide a gradual process of change and protect the former president and his family from calls that they give up their wealth or even face trial.

But it is not clear whether people will tolerate that.

In short, Suharto leaves Habibie and the army to deal with the likes of Reta Simenjuntak, not to mention the three year-old daughter she was lugging on her hip. Simenjuntak, a cheerful 29-year-old housewife, had been so outraged by Suharto that on Wednesday she defied threats of bloodshed from the armed forces and took her children with her to parliament building to join in the crowd of tens of thousands demanding that Suharto be ousted immediately.

"They were trying to scare people," Simenjuntak, a mom in sandals, said of the army's warnings. And then she looked around at the exuberant crowd and giggled, saying: "But it sure looks as if it didn't work."

Almost by the hour, the fear has been draining away in Indonesia. The result is the emergence of a new class of people like Simenjuntak - citizens, and not just subjects - who will profoundly reshape the country in the years.

People like Simenjuntak see control of the nation falling not so much into the lap of the vice president, B.J. Habibie, as into their own hands.

The rise of an assertive citizenry, if that is sustained in Indonesia, would have far-reaching reverberations in a region where people have tended to obey their leaders meekly. Countries like Singapore and Malaysia, for example, have many democratic forms but the mood is deferential and respectful, while in nations like China and Vietnam there are not even the democratic forms.

A dozen years ago, the "people power" revolution of the Philippines rocked other countries in Asia, helping to inspire the democracy movement that prevailed in South Korea in 1987 and promoting greater citizen activism in Taiwan and Hong Kong and even China. The overthrow of Suharto after 32 years would likely ripple through Asia with the same destabilizing effects for authoritarian rulers.

"The first step is for Suharto to step down," said Listriani, a 20-year-old tourism student,

who like many Indonesians uses just one name. "But he must also give up his family wealth. Whether he goes to prison will depend on the depth of his sins. The police will have to investigate that and see how uch he abused his authority."

Some of the student protesters were wildly cheered on Wednesday when they carried a puppet of Suharto hanging in effigy, and other students distributed a poster of Suharto as a prisoner behind bars. It is now routine for protesters to say that Suharto should give up his wealth and perhaps even be imprisoned for corruption.

For Indonesia's Government, the challenge will be how to rule a nation in which increasingly each person may feel a right to keep a finger on the steering wheel. The institution that used to keep the passengers in the back seat and maintain order is the Army, but it appears to have lost much of its ability to intimidate.

"We're not afraid of the Army," said Harrington Garang, a burly 33-year-old contractor. "The Army is our friend."

It was an odd thing to say, for the Army was not looking particularly friendly at that moment. troops had erected barbed wire barricades backed by tanks to block access to the square in Jakarta where a major rally had been planned for Thursday. But those who went out on to the streets anyway were not much impressed.

"It's just a way for the military to try to scare people," laughed Syafruddin, a 39-year-old lawyer who brought his two daughters on his motorcycle to cheer for the students at the parliament building. "The army is bluffing. Except in the case of riots, there won't be any shooting."

Syafruddin's seven-year-old girl, Rani, piped up stoutly: "I'm not scared." She explained that her uncle is an army officer and that she knows that the army would not shoot little girls.

One of the Indonesian army's problems appears to be the same as the Chinese army's in 1989: public relations work has been so successful in portraying the armed forces as a "people's army" that the troops are not very scary to the public. The friendly trust that people feel for the Army means that they casually defy it.

"The army only shows force," scoffed Jamil Djardjis, a 55-year-old lawyer. "It won't ever use it."

The upshot is that threats are ineffective. The Army may be holding Indonesia at gunpoint, but people do not pay it much heed because they are convinced it will never shoot.

So the army may not be able to achieve its objectives - controlling the process of change - merely by threatening the use of force. That could conceivably increase the likelihood of a coup or of the actual use of force, as the generals jostle with the citizens for control of the country.

It is remarkable how many Indonesian protesters simply assume that they are now in command and do not even consider the possibility of a violent crackdown.

"If we look at history in the Philippines or in Iran, then people power is too strong to resist," said Paiman, a 38 year-old high school teacher, referring to the 1979 Iranian revolution and the 1986 Philippine popular uprising.

What about Tiananmen Square in China, he was asked.

"Oh, that," he said. "Hmmm. Yes, well, of course in China people power didn't work. But Indonesia is not a Communist country."

New York Times May 21, 1998

U.S. Officials Say Indonesia Has To Look Beyond Suharto's Successor And The Military

By Philip Shenon

WASHINGTON -- Clinton Administration officials said tonight that Indonesia's new President, Bacharuddin Jusuf Habibie, is unlikely to last long in the role, and that the fate of the world's fourth most populous nation is now firmly in the hands of the Indonesian military.

The officials, reacting to the decision of President Suharto to step down tonight after 32 years of iron-fisted rule, said that Habibie was clearly unsuited to the role of President, given his unorthodox economic views and close association with President Suharto, who was seen as almost a father to Habibie.

There was no immediate official reaction from the White House or the State Department, to the announcement of the transfer of power. Earlier in the day, Clinton Administration officials hinted strongly that President Suharto should step down in the face of the worst political violence in that nation in more than 30 years.

"We have to look beyond Habibie because no one will accept him as President for more than a short time," said an Administration official involved in Indonesian policy, speaking on condition of anonymity. "It's a handful of army generals who will now determine what happens."

Daniel Lev, a professor of political science at the University of Washington and an expert on Indonesia, said that President Habibie "has almost no support anywhere in society" and that his appointment as President will strike fear into the hearts of Western economists and international investors. "Comparing Suharto and Habibie is like comparing two rotten apples," he said.

Administration officials, speaking on condition that they not be named, said the White House, the State Department and the Pentagon were considering contingency plans to offer exile to President Suharto -- or, at least, safe transportation out of Indonesia aboard an American military plane -- if his hasty departure might avert more bloodshed.

Until Wednesday, the Clinton Administration had spoken in generalities of the need for political reform in Indonesia, but it had turned aside questions of whether that meant that the United States believed Suharto must step down.

Administration officials said that by calling Wednesday for a quick transition, the Administration was making clear that -- despite its lavish praise for Suharto's past leadership -- the Indonesian leader had to go if the world's fourth most populous nation is to avoid economic collapse.

"President Suharto has given much to his country over the past 30 years, raising Indonesia's standing in the world and hastening Indonesia's economic growth," Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright said earlier Wednesday in a graduation speech at the United States Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn.

"Now he has the opportunity for an historic act of statesmanship -- one that will preserve his legacy as a man who not only led his country, but who provided for its democratic transition," she said.

Despite the Administration's obvious efforts Wednesday to rachet up the pressure on Suharto, officials conceded that the United States had only a limited ability to influence events in Indonesia.

"This is not the Philippines, this is not Marcos," said a senior Administration official, referring to President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Philippines, who stepped down in 1986 largely at the urging of the United States.

"Marcos listened to Washington," he said. "While we have long historical ties to the Philippines, we have very few with Indonesia. Suharto has always been a friend to the United States, but he has never taken direction from us."

In Washington, the International Monetary Fund said that it would have to work out a new economic rescue plan with Indonesia as a result of the damage done to its economy by the political chaos of recent weeks. It would be Indonesia's fourth bailout package since the economic crisis began there last October.

"If there is a protracted period of political uncertainty, it is unlikely that we will get back there quickly," said Stanley Fischer, the No. 2 official at the fund, referring to the suspen-

sion of all aid in the $43 billion package for Indonesia.

He said in meeting with reporters that the fund, which has publicly shied away from putting political conditions on its loans, would be sensitive to actions of the Indonesian military. "It must be obvious to everyone in Indonesia that if they had a really hard crackdown, the board of the I.M.F. would say no to any further funds."

In her speech, Albright repeated the American call on the Indonesian military for restraint in the use of violence against protesters. "In this delicate and difficult time, we strongly urge the Indonesian authorities to use maximum restraint in respose to peaceful demonstrations," she said.

The Marine Corps said Wednesday that because of the threat of additional violence, it had alerted marines now involved in training exercises in Thailand to be ready to travel to Indonesia to take part in the evacuation of Americans still there. The Marine Commandant, Gen. Charles Krulak, said that a Marine amphibious ready group in Thailand is "prepared and they do have contingency plans."

New York Times May 21, 1998

In Statements To Pakistan, India Flaunts Nuclear Power

By John F. Burns

NEW DELHI, India -- Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee visited the site of India's nuclear tests on Wednesday and put Pakistan on notice that it should adopt a more conciliatory attitude that recognizes India's newly enhanced military power.

"We want peaceful coexistence but the frequent threats to security forced India to conduct the nuclear tests to silence its enemies and show its strength," Vajpayee told soldiers at a camp near Pokharan, the testing range in the northwestern desert where India conducted five underground nuclear tests last week.

The Indian leader's assertive posture followed similar warnings to Pakistan by another top government official, Home Minister Lal Krishna Advani. On Wednesday, for the second time in 36 hours, Advani issued a blunt warning to Pakistan to ease pressures on India from Pakistani-backed insurgents in the disputed territory of Kashmir, or face what Advani called "a pro-active" response. He did not say what that might be.

The statements by India's two most powerful political leaders lent new significance to the nuclear tests. The tests were initially presented as a defensive measure intended to allow India to ward off nuclear threats from Pakistan, which has had a covert nuclear weapons program for 25 years, and from China.

But the warnings to Pakistan, coupled to the reminders oon Wednesday that India regards itself as a nuclear power, seemed aimed at shifting the region's strategic balance in India's favor. And the nuclear tests appear increasingly to have been motivated at least in part by the assertive Hindu nationalism that guides the Vajpayee government.

The Indian statements were bound to further heighten tensions with Pakistan, which has been weighing pressures from the United States and other nations not to conduct its own nuclear test against domestic political demands to match India.

Vajpayee was only 70 miles from Pakistan's border on Wednesday when he visited the nuclear testing range with a group that included the defense minister, George Fernandes, and the top two scientists who helped carry out the tests, A.P.J. Abdul Kalam and Rajagopal Chidambaram. The group also included Indian reporters, but excluded all non-Indian foreign correspondents.

Coverage of the visit on Indian television showed Vajpayee walking around what was identified as the largest of the craters made by the tests, a deep depression in the desert that India's state broadcasting network said was at least 40 feet deep and 1,000 feet across.

Vajpayee, 72, was shown wearing a baseball cap emblazoned with the code word used by India for the tests, shakti, a Hindu word meaning power. He smiled broadly, shook the hands of soldiers and others on the test team, and, at one point, stood on a makeshift wooden bridge above what appeared to be the top of one of the shafts sunk into the desert for the blasts. Later, he addressed troops and officials, calling the tests "this marvelous achievement that has amazed the world."

The prime minister also accused Western nations that have condemned the tests and imposed economic sanctions on India, including the United States, of hypocrisy. "The West argued that while they could have nuclear weapons, we couldn't," he said. "Why? What crime have we committed?"

He added: "We had to conduct these tests to show our strength after these countries paid no heed to our pleadings that they stop manufacturing nuclear weapons that intimidate others. They continued to build their nuclear arsenal, and they never listened to us. The kind of arsenal they have can destroy this world many times over."

A still more assertive stance was taken by Advani, the home minister, who was the first to demand that Pakistan change its policies toward India as a result of the nuclear tests, in remarks in New Delhi on Monday. On Wednesday, despite angry protests from Pakistan after his first salvo, he repeated the remarks.

Referring to India's "bold and decisive" action, Advani said the tests had brought about a "qualitatively new stage" in relations with Pakistan. "Islamabad should realize the change in the geostrategic situation in the region and the world, roll back its anti-India policy, especially with regard to Kashmir, and join India in the common pursuit of peace in the Indian subcontinent," he said. "Any other course will be futile and costly for Pakistan."

New York Times May 21, 1998

China Seems To Deny Pakistan A Nuclear Umbrella

By Elisabeth Rosenthal

BEIJING -- As Pakistani leaders struggled to decide whether to conduct a nuclear test in response to India's recent tests, a high-level delegation from Pakistan slipped quietly into Beijing early Monday. Wednesday, just as quietly, it left.

The Chinese officials played down the meeting, calling it a "routine consultation between our two foreign ministries." But diplomats in Islamabad had said the Pakistani foreign minister, Shamshad Ahmed, who led the group, was hoping to get a guarantee of nuclear protection should India attack. Such a declaration, some Western diplomats had hoped, would help persuade Pakistan not to carry out a nuclear test of its own.

What Ahmed brought back to Pakistan was far less: On returning to Islamabad, he announced that China would not impose economic sanctions should Pakistan conduct a nuclear test. But China has made no public promises of nuclear protection.

Indeed, Chinese government experts said that although China is sympathetic to its longtime ally, it is very unlikely to make Pakistan such an offer and will probably quietly oppose any Pakistani test.

Although Chinese officials have not joined Western nations in publicly urging Pakistan to refrain from testing, they have condemned India's tests and pointedly restated their opposition to nuclear testing.

"China will not encourage Pakistan to conduct its own nuclear test, and China is not a country that provides nuclear umbrellas to other countries," said a senior researcher at a Chinese government research institute, who spoke on condition of anonymity.

The Pakistanis' pilgrimage to China underscores a new and delicate role for China, experts

said. The Indian tests have tested its ability to juggle the needs of longtime friends like Pakistan alongside the demands of important nations like the United States and India, with which China has been trying to improve ties.

"China's challenge is to reassure Pakistan that they'll stand by it without inflaming relations with India or the U.S.," said Robert S. Ross, a China expert at Boston College.

China has been Pakistan's main supplier of military technology, particularly for missiles. This sharing has been a chronic irritant in Beijing's relations with the United States, as well as India. At the same time, however, the Chinese clearly place great value on their developing relationship with India.

"China has now readjusted its policies in south Asia so that it now places equal importance on relations with India and Pakistan," said Shang Hui Peng, a professor at Beijing University. "I think that's very important for regional security."

Some Chinese experts said that although the relationship between China and India had remained somewhat strained, they were surprised to hear India's leaders say a threat from China had necessitated nuclear testing and that India had instead used the pretext of a threat from China as an excuse to test.

"Since the world has come out for disarmament, it's no longer acceptable to say we're testing because we're a great power and want to be part of the nuclear club," said a former Chinese official. "Much better to say there's this big nuclear power on our border so we have to."

But he said China's "strong reaction" to the tests had also been "quite cautious" in the hope that ties with India could be preserved.

Baltimore Sun May 21, 1998 Pg. 32

Anti-Serb violence erupts once more in Kosovo

Policeman is kidnapped, vehicles are shot up

ASSOCIATED PRESS

PRISTINA, Yugoslavia — A Serbian policeman was kidnapped from a bus and three other vehicles were riddled with bullets in the latest outbursts of violence in Serbia's separatist Kosovo province, Serbian officials said today.

No one was injured, but the policeman, who was traveling in civilian clothes, was missing, according to the Serb-run media center in Pristina, the provincial capital.

He was abducted by ethnic Albanian militants from a bus on the road from Pristina to Pec — Kosovo's main east-west artery.

In the other incidents, two Serbian trucks were riddled with bullets after drivers were forced to stop and harassed for hours by Albanian militants. Another bus was sprayed with machine gun fire when its driver ignored orders by the guerrillas to stop.

The increasingly dangerous conditions on Kosovo roads have led to food shortages in isolated areas west of Pristina, where most of the fighting between Serbian police and ethnic Albanian militants has been concentrated.

About 40 percent of Kosovo is controlled by the ethnic Albanian Kosovo Liberation Army, which is fighting for independence for the province from Serbia.

Albanians outnumber Serbs 9-to-1 in Kosovo. Most want independence, which Serbia refuses. Serbia stripped Kosovo of broad autonomy in 1989, arguing that it had to protect the Serb minority on land treasured by Serbs as the cradle of their culture and Orthodox Church. A heavy police and army presence has ruled repressively ever since.

Shuttle diplomacy by U.S. envoy Richard C. Holbrooke last week managed to initiate talks between the Serbs and ethnic Albanians. Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic and Kosovo Albanian leader Ibrahim Rugova met for the first time and designated respective teams to meet weekly. Their first meeting is tomorrow.

In other developments in the Balkans, Yugoslavia's federal parliament approved a Milosevic protege as the new federal premier yesterday, ignoring protests from Montenegro.

Hard-line deputies who control both chambers of the federal parliament backed Momir Bulatovic as the new premier. His nomination by Milosevic deepened the confrontation between Serbia and the reformist leadership in Montenegro.

Defense Daily May 21, 1998 Pg. 5

House To Mandate Backup Contractor For THAAD

By Sheila Foote

The House will attach to the FY '99 Defense Authorization Bill an amendment mandating that the DoD choose "as expeditiously as possible" a second contractor as an alternative to Lockheed Martin [LMT] for development and production of the interceptor missile for the Army's Theater High Altitude Area Defense system, Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) said yesterday.

Weldon told *Defense Daily* he expected no opposition to the amendment, which he co-sponsored with Rep. John Spratt (D-S.C.). The amendment signals a growing concern in Congress over Lockheed Martin's management of the missile portion of the program, which has failed in five consecutive intercept attempts.

The House yesterday began consideration of the $270.4 billion FY '99 Defense Authorization Bill, which it hopes to complete as early as today. Only a few of the 48 amendments that will be offered affect DoD procurement or research and development programs.

The THAAD amendment authorizes DoD to spend $30 million for establishment of the alternative contractor and directs that it use a "leader-follower" acquisition strategy.

"The [defense] secretary shall take such steps as necessary to ensure that the prime contractor for that system prepares the selected alternative contractor so as to enable the alternative contractor to be able (if necessary) to assume the responsibilities for development or production of an interceptor missile for that system," according to amendment language.

The amendment transfers a total of $142. 7 million that the Army had proposed to use in an upcoming engineering, manufacturing and development phase to the demonstration/validation phase. Because of the missile's most recent failure in early May,

the missile program's entrance into EMD will be further delayed.

But the amendment directs the secretary of defense to proceed in approving for EMD two other elements of THAAD that have worked well during tests, the battle management and command, control and communications component (BMC3) and the Ground Based Radar, which is being developed by Raytheon [RTNA/RTNB].

The amendment also prohibits DoD from obligating funds to buy 40 User Operational Evaluation System missiles until THAAD has had two successful intercept tests.

Much of yesterday's debate on the bill involved expressions of grave concern by House members over the apparent transfer of sensitive launch technology to China by U.S. contractors Hughes [GMH] and Loral [LOR] as they helped China investigate a failed launch of a U.S. commercial satellite.

With legislators calling for a congressional investigation into the matter, the House yesterday overwhelmingly approved a series of amendments barring exports of missile or satellite-related technology to China.

The issue involves a conflict between national security and the business interests of U.S. aerospace contractors who benefit from China's low-cost launch option and are interested in helping improve launch reliability, said Rep. Duncan Hunter (R-Calif.).

Hunter said that the technologies transferred by the U.S. companies will help China improve the long-range missiles that can carry nuclear payloads. The technologies apparently provided to the Chinese include encryption devices, launcher attitude control systems, stage separation systems, payload dispersal and radiation hardening.

China uses the same Long March missiles to launch satellites and to carry nuclear payloads.

Five congressmen offered four separate amendments on the subject of aerospace technology export to China, each of which was approved.

An amendment by Rep. Doug Bereuter (R-Neb.), approved 414 to 7, prohibits U.S. participation in investigations of launch failures of U.S. satellites launched in China. An amendment by Rep. Joel Hefley (R-Colo.), approved 412 to 6, bars the transfer to China of any U.S. missile equipment or missile-related technology.

Hunter offered an amendment prohibiting the export or re-export of any U.S. satellites or satellite components to China, which the House approved 364 to 54.

And the House also approved 417 to 4 a non-binding "sense of Congress" statement that U.S. business interests should not have higher priority than national security interests and that the U.S. should not enter new agreements with China on space or missile technology.

Baltimore Sun May 21, 1998 Pg. 1

Dispute sends Navy air show into a stall

■ **Maneuvers:** *A display of precision flying by the Blue Angels for Naval Academy Commissioning Week is delayed by a neighbor's refusal to leave a restricted area.*

By TOM BOWMAN AND NEAL THOMPSON
SUN STAFF

The annual gut-wrenching performance by the Navy's Blue Angels supersonic stunt flying team over the Severn River was nearly grounded yesterday when a famous Washington lawyer refused to relocate a lawn party.

The show, a 45-year Commissioning Week tradition at the Naval Academy, went off late and only after days of furious bargaining among top academy officials, the Navy, the Federal Aviation Administration administrator and the lawyer, who insisted he would hold a backyard Blue Angels party.

Each side waited for the other to blink, while throngs of spectators looked skyward, oblivious to the drama on the ground. In the end, the lawyer blinked.

Brendan Sullivan, noted for his colorful representation of Iran-contra figure Oliver North, had balked at moving a party from his Homewood Road house, which sits across from the academy and right inside restricted air space known as an "aerobatic box."

The FAA refused to grant a permit for the show until he did move the party.

Academy Superintendent Adm. Charles R. Larson crossed the river to plead with Sullivan, offering to transport Sullivan and friends on a Navy ship and then to a VIP area at the academy, sources said.

Less than a half-hour before the 2 p.m. show, Sullivan agreed to shift the festivities to his porch, according to one source.

Larson called FAA Administrator Jane Garvey to ask her approval.

She refused, telling the admiral it was not enough, said sources familiar with the dispute.

Not until Sullivan and his party moved down the street did the F/A-18 jets screech over the water.

As 2 p.m. came and went, an academy public address announcer told crowds the show would be delayed 20 to 25 minutes.

But they were never told why.

The six Blue Angels pilots, meanwhile, sat on the tarmac at Andrews Air Force Base, waiting to learn whether they'd perform.

The Naval Academy prepared a statement to be read over the loudspeaker, telling spectators the show had been canceled.

Sullivan, on the other hand, was apparently confident that FAA would back down. He is not, after all, a man to be ignored.

During a famous exchange in 1987 with a senator on the Iran Contra Committee, he snapped: "I'm not a potted plant. I'm here as the lawyer. That's my job."

"We've been here 20 years," said Sullivan, who 90 minutes before show time was sitting calmly beneath an umbrella at a table with some friends.

He said that if his back yard was safe for 20 years, he didn't understand why it should suddenly be off limits this year.

Sullivan declined to make further comment, saying it was his policy not to talk to reporters.

Family members lounged around the pool while other friends arrived carrying trays of

sandwiches, one of them asking: "Are we ready for a fight?"

The Naval Academy declined to comment on negotiations that in recent days had sent some of its top officers scurrying between Annapolis and Washington — and out to Sullivan's house.

Spokesman Cmdr. Mike Brady said safety is a concern at air shows and the "academy is pleased that together with the FAA and local residents we were able to satisfy all the requirements."

James Peters, a spokesman for the FAA's Eastern Region, based in New York, said the academy was granted a waiver in March for the air show.

The usual 3,300-foot-wide aerobatic box for jet-powered aircraft was reduced to 2,700 feet to accommodate the Severn area.

"The regulations are written so people can go the air show and enjoy themselves in a safe environment," said Peters.

"We're very strict."

One FAA official familiar with the dispute, who requested anonymity, said: "I'm glad Mr. Sullivan saw the light. It would have inconvenienced a lot of people. Common sense prevailed in this case."

The official could not recall any similar disputes over restricted air space involving the Blue Angels.

Meanwhile, in the VIP viewing section on Dewey Field at the academy, Navy officials buzzed with word of the show that almost wasn't, some of them pointing across the river to show others where the potential show-stopper lived.

John Michalski, who lives in the buffer zone and had to watch the show from a neighbor's back yard, said he learned about a month ago that his own yard would be off limits.

"I got a personal call from Admiral Larson," said Michalski, a 1960 academy graduate.

"And he expressed concern that it was beyond his control and the FAA would shut it down."

He said Larson offered to send a YP — a mini Navy ship — across the Severn to pick up him and his guests and transport them to VIP seating at the academy.

But Michalski declined.

"The academy's always been good to us," he said, "so I think a little give and take is required."

Larson made the same compensation offer to Sullivan — and many more — but to no avail.

One of Sullivan's neighbors, retired Navy Capt. Richard Lazenby, held his annual Blue Angels party for 250 guests yesterday — a stone's throw beyond the buffer zone.

He said he understood Sullivan's frustration and called it "ridiculous" that the FAA would threaten to shut down such a high-profile event under pressure from a lone holdout.

"I can't believe this is going on," he said minutes before show time, while guests mingled beneath a huge blue-and-gold party canopy.

And a neighbor who lives just outside the restricted zone said the zone was "silly" and the proxity of the planes to spectators, even if it's dangerous, is part of the thrill.

"I can sit in my pool and see whether the pilots shaved or not, they fly so low," she said.

"So what difference does 2,700 feet make when you've got high-performance aircraft flying so fast and so low."

Depot Caucus Seeks To Thwart USAF's Depot Competition Authority

Rep. James Hansen (R-UT) will press Defense Secretary William Cohen this week to remove source selection authority from the Air Force in a multi-million dollar competition for depot work at McClellan AFB, CA, according to Hansen's legislative director. Other congressional aides said this week Hansen's call for changing the competition's source selection authority has the support of several members of the congressional depot caucus.

Hansen's aide, Bill Johnson, said it has not been determined whether Hansen will either seek to meet with Cohen on the issue or send him a letter. He added that the House National Security Committee will conduct hearings early next month on issues relating to the depot competition at McClellan, home of the Sacramento Air Logistics Center.

Among those Johnson said will be called to testify are Darleen Druyun, the principal deputy assistant secretary of the Air Force for acquisition and management, and F. Whitten Peters, acting Air Force secretary. Druyun, a career civil servant, acts as the source selection authority for the Sacramento competition.

Congressional sources said lawmakers are concerned that the Air Force has been tainted by alleged administration influence to ensure the winning bidder for the Sacramento competition keeps the work at the California facility.

Cohen's recent decision to appoint independent advisors to oversee the evaluation of bids for the logistics center work has not allayed congressional fears that the process will be conducted without political influence from the White House, the sources said.

Congressional staff for depot supporters expressed concern that the Defense Department has not explained fully the extent to which the advisors will be involved in the evaluation process. They pointed to a May 12 DOD statement that says the advisors will "have access to all source selection information they consider necessary" and "provide independent advice to the source selection authority" as being too vague.

According to the Pentagon statement, the advisors will work with Druyun to "reinforce the perception of objectivity" in the evaluation of proposals for the work at the logistics center "and assure the source selection process is conducted in a manner that is consistent with the request for proposals and the evaluation criteria."

But Johnson responded, "We want to know the extent to which the advisors will be involved in the evaluation process. Are they just there to rubber-stamp a decision by Druyun?" Johnson added that Hansen will ask Cohen to provide a better explanation of how active the panel will be in the evaluation process.

The panel includes: Air Force Gen. Robert Marsh (ret.), former commander of Air Force Systems Command; Air Force Lt. Gen. Kenneth Eickmann (ret.), former commander of the Aeronautical Systems Center, Air Force Materiel Command; and Dennis Trosch, who served as the deputy general counsel for acquisition and logistics in the DOD office of the general counsel.

Pentagon spokesman Glenn Flood said on May 19 that the three-person advisory panel does not have a charter that outlines the group's responsibilities. The panel's formation is a first for DOD, Flood said, and the May 12 statement announcing its formation is the only written statement on the scope of the group's activities.

Several congressional sources connected with the depot caucus maintained the Air Force has been working for almost three years to implement a presidential directive to keep the McClellan jobs in Sacramento. Consequently, there will never be a perception of objectivity with the Sacramento competition as long as the source selection authority rests with the Air Force, they said.

"We don't trust the Air Force acquisition office," one source said on May 19. "They've got enough baggage to fill a 747."

These sources suggested removing Druyun from the process and placing source selection authority with acquisition executives

from the other services, or even with independent advisory panel. McClellan was slated to be closed under the 1995 base realignment and closure round, but prior to the 1996 election, Clinton pledged to save the 8,700 jobs at the base by "privatizing" the facility in place.

Controversy over the president's decision to privatize the facility erupted, as critics said the president's decision was an attempt to curry favor with California voters in an election year. As a result, they charged, Clinton undermined the integrity of the base closure and realignment (BRAC) process, which was supposed to be nonpolitical.

Such concerns were dramatically heightened late last month when Hansen uncovered and made public a memo from Peters to Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre on the Sacramento competition. The memo relays a request from White House Deputy Chief of Staff John Podesta for Hamre to convince Lockheed Martin to bid on the McClellan competition, and keep the work in Sacramento (*Inside the Pentagon, May 7, p13).*

After Hansen released the memo, several legislators reacted by declaring the BRAC process politically tainted. Depot supporters in particular said the memo's existence not only questions the validity of the Sacramento competition but also kills any chances Congress will approve additional base closures as long as Clinton is president.

"The collusion between the White House, the deputy secretary of defense and the secretary of the Air Force, who is the ultimate source selection authority for this competition, to favor one contractor, and one location, is outrageous, unethical and potentially illegal," reads an April 30 letter from Hansen and eight other members of the House National Security Committee condemning Peters' memo.

Podesta, Hamre and Peters have all denied allegations from lawmakers that the administration is attempting to inappropriately influence the competition. Hamre has maintained that the memo's intent was to save taxpayer dollars by encouraging more competition. Cohen reacted by naming the panel of independent advisors to monitor the competition. He also accepted a decision by Peters to recuse himself from any involvement in the evaluation process.

At present, only one team consisting of Boeing and Ogden Air Logistics Center at Hill AFB, UT, has formed to bid on the work now performed at the McClellan facility, which has been valued at over $200 million annually. Bids for the competition are due on June 19, and a contract may be awarded as early as August. -- *Keith J. Costa*

Wall Street Journal May 21, 1998 Pg. 16

How About An Antitrust Probe Of The Pentagon?

By Harvey M. Sapolsky and Eugene Gholz

The Justice Department's busy Antitrust Division doesn't have enough to do taking on the world's biggest software company. It's also battling some of the country's largest defense contractors.

Along with the Department of Defense, Justice is opposing the proposed merger between Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman on antitrust grounds. The government claims that the combination of the two companies will hinder innovation by creating a monopoly in some weapon subsystems. Like Microsoft's Bill Gates, the companies' leaders express shock: The government has previously encouraged mergers in the defense industry, even heralding the consolidations as evidence of a successful market adjustment to the end of the Cold War. But it is the public that should be shocked by the government's misunderstanding of the nature of competition in an industry it essentially regulates. The real monopoly danger comes not from the defense contractors, but from their clients--the armed services.

Defense procurement is not a free market. The armed services are the only buyers. The business is highly cyclical, up in wars and usually down during peacetime. Cold War procurement had three peaks: Korea, Vietnam and the Reagan-era buildup. Although a few government-owned arsenals and shipyards exist, nearly all the development and manufacture of new weapons is done by contractors. Defense expenditures climbed sharply during the 1980s, but today, despite the demise of the Soviet Union, they are still higher than in 1976, the low point of Cold War spending.

The recent wave of defense-industry mergers and acquisitions began as the Cold War ended. Lockheed acquired part of General Dynamics, then merged with Martin Marietta and absorbed Loral, itself an amalgamation of several electronics companies. Boeing acquired the defense portion of Rockwell and then merged with McDonnell Douglas. Raytheon, now the third-largest contractor, bought E Systems and Hughes Aircraft. Northrop merged with Grumman, and that combination then acquired the defense portion of Westinghouse.

But the mergers and acquisitions did not lead to a significant reduction in production capacity, which would normally occur in a declining industry--in this case, one returning to peacetime levels of demand. Not one major weapon-platform line (a military aircraft, ship or armored vehicle) has closed down since the end of the Cold War. By contrast, many lines closed during the Cold War, when the existence of an imminent threat gave the armed services a large say in the weapon-acquisition process. The contractors that offended these customers or otherwise failed to perform risked going out of business. Recall that Curtiss-Wright, North American, Chance Vought, Republic, Fairchild and Martin all once made military aircraft. They lost their prime-contractor status long ago.

But today, all the same weapons lines are being produced as in 1991. Defense has become a jobs program, attuned more to congressional politics than to the preferences of the services.

To be sure, there have been significant cuts in defense expenditures, particularly if one measures from the peak of the Reagan buildup. Most industry sources are inclined to do just that. More than a million defense-contractor employees have left the industry since 1986. But at the same time, one million servicemen and Pentagon civilians left their defense jobs. Compared instead with 1976, today there are one-third fewer soldiers, one-quarter fewer defense civil servants and one-quarter more defense-contractor employees. Troops have returned home from overseas, bases have closed here and abroad, but the contractors' defense-production facilities remain virtually untouched by cutbacks.

America's security would not be jeopardized by cuts in weapons production. We have thousands of first-line aircraft and tanks in storage and are retiring ships with half their planned service life remaining. Real risks come from not maintaining the readiness of our existing forces and from failing to experiment with new designs. Contractors lobbying to keep subsidies flowing to their amortized weapon systems have already forced cuts in training and research. Their constant quest is for more "modernization" funds to redesign Cold War-era weapon systems. Instead of worrying about whether or not there is one merger too many, the government ought to be concerned about the failure of approved mergers to result in a reduction of lobbying for unneeded weapons.

The competition that counts in defense takes place among buyers. A merger between Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman certainly will create monopolies in some weapon components. It will also link together an aircraft assembler, Lockheed, with a strong elec-

tronics-system integrator, Northrop Grumman. But none of this really determines the level of competition in the industry. The government retains the power to specify the number of suppliers: If it wants another supplier, to enhance security or for any other reason, it can use various subsidies to create one, as it has many times before.

The real threat to competition in the defense sector is that the government itself is pushing hard for joint programs among the several armed services. With jointness--cobbling together the requirements of multiple services into a single weapon-design project--comes monopsony. And the preferences of a single buyer limit the opportunities for innovation, no matter how many suppliers exist. Joint programs are unhappy compromises, neither efficient nor innovative. And only a foolish seller fails to follow the wishes of a monopsonist, as Curtiss-Wright learned the hard way.

Rather than challenge the Lockheed Martin-Northrop Grumman merger, the administration should challenge recent government policies. The unwillingness to force closures in defense-production lines wastes billions of dollars. The march toward joint military procurement stifles competition among the services--and thus also stifles the incentive for the contractors to design creatively.

Mr. Sapolsky is a professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Mr. Gholz is a national security fellow at the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University.

Baltimore Sun May 21, 1998 Pg. 30

Larson's class

■ **Naval Academy:** *Tomorrow's commissioning marks departure of a leader, the second time around.*

TOMORROW is graduation day at the U.S. Naval Academy. President Clinton plans to deliver the commencement address to the 908 men and women of the Class of '98. These midshipmen and their families should be proud that the students have completed one of the most intellectually, physically and emotionally challenging educations this nation offers.

Adm. Charles R. Larson will join the graduates in bidding farewell to the academy. When this class enrolled as plebes four years ago, Admiral Larson was beginning his second tour as superintendent, the highest ranking officer to oversee the school. He was previously superintendent from 1983-1986.

The Navy asked him to lead the officer training school again to restore a sense of mission and honor that had been eroded by a series of scandals involving cheating, hazing, sexual abuse, drugs and theft.

Just as the newly commissioned ensigns and second lieutenants will launch their careers in the Navy and Marines, Admiral Larson will end his military career 40 years to the month after it began.

His high expectations at Annapolis have resulted in improved behavior and performance. These graduates are the first to have completed his revamped curriculum that stresses leadership, ethics and discipline. A highly charged esprit de corps now pervades "The Yard," as the Annapolis campus is called.

Not all mids have been up to the standards, but the institution is no longer rocked by scandal. Admiral Larson leaves the academy stronger than when he arrived.

As grueling as their educational experience, these new officers may find their future in the armed services even more trying. The post-Cold War world is not a stable place. Academy graduates will be called on to man ships, fly planes and storm ashore should trouble erupt in the Middle East, Asia or Latin America.

These young men and women will put their lives on the line so the rest of us can enjoy ours in peace and freedom.

Washington Times May 21, 1998 Pg. 22

A double standard pervades the military justice system

An item in your May 14 Inside the Ring column ("Single standard") provides senior enlisted advisers of the respective military services with an opportunity to propagandize that there is no double standard in meting out military justice for senior/general officers and enlisted personnel.

You need to get out into the field and talk to the troops, one on one, outside the hearing of these senior enlisted advisers. These advisers were, after all, selected for their politically correct conformity. Military personnel — particularly the enlisted force and junior officers —will tell you the truth: There is a double standard, which is well-entrenched and well-recognized by those being led. They know about it and must accept it as a fact of life.

You would be further surprised by the percentage of military personnel who lack confidence in the senior leadership of each of the services. What the Tailhook scandal did for junior officers' confidence in the Navy's senior uniformed and civilian leadership, the Gene McKinney/David Hale dichotomy will do for rank-and-file perceptions of Army "justice."

Some day, perhaps, the general- and flag-officer corps of our military will live up to the standard it sets for the enlisted personnel in the officers' charge. It would be refreshing to learn that the generals have ceased worrying about their next star and have begun doing right by the enlisted personnel entrusted to lay their lives on the line. But sadly, that day has not yet come.

CHARLES W. GITTINS
Alexandria

■ *Mr. Gittins is an attorney for former Sgt. Maj. Gene McKinney.*

Editor's Note: The column referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, May 14, 1998, Pg. 16.

Wall Street Journal
May 21, 1998 Pg. 1

Cambodia's Prince Ranariddh quit as head of an opposition alliance contesting July 26 elections, despite an extensive diplomatic effort to restore him as the chief challenger of Hun Sen's regime. The prince will support opposition leader Son Soubert.

Washington Post May 21, 1998 Pg. 27

Innocent Of Honor

By George F. Will

This ninth year of the century's 10th decade is taking a toll on one of the century's characteristic chimeras. Liberalism and (which is much the same thing) wishful thinking favor arms control as a means of taming the unruly world with pieces of paper. However, two attempts at arms control are collapsing simultaneously, with reverberations in a third conflict that has an arms control dimension.

President Clinton says he is "encouraged" by Iraq's cooperation with United Nations inspectors attempting to eliminate Iraq's chemical and biological weapons. The head of those inspectors, Richard Butler, says there has been "virtually no progress" in six months. The president's U.N. ambassador, Bill Richardson, says "there's been zero progress."

So Israel knows that the president makes foreign policy pronouncements that are disconnected from reality. Israel is in a "peace process" with an entity, the Palestine Authority, which, in violation of the Oslo accords, remains committed, in its unamended charter, to Israel's destruction. The accords contain arms control: the PA is limited to a police force of 24,000. Instead, the PA has an army twice that size.

The president, who is "encouraged" by Iraq's behavior, wants Israel to accept his estimate of Israel's security needs. He has helped China, by technology transfers, to develop nuclear weapons and delivery systems. He has been relaxed about China's helping Pakistan toward nuclear capability. He is startled that India wants nuclear weapons.

India, although provoked by recent U.S. policy, would have acquired nuclear weapons anyway. With a population 45 percent larger than the combined populations of four of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council (the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia), India is not impressed by "international norms" defined by others to ratify their advantages.

Brent Scowcroft, national security adviser to presidents Ford and Bush, and his colleague in a Washington consulting firm, David Sloan, express (in the Los Angeles Times) the foreign policy elite's dreamy disappointment that India has affronted "international norms." India, they say, must decide whether to "rejoin the global community." But it is peculiar to speak of a "global community" with India's one-fifth of the world's population exiled (by whom?) therefrom.

And what is the pertinent "norm"? That there shall be no nuclear proliferation? Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's national security adviser, notes that U.S. policy (not quite the same thing as an "international norm") "all along has been one of selective and preferential proliferation." U.S. policy openly helped Britain to become a nuclear power, less openly assisted France, and did not become exercised about Israel's developing such weapons.

For 50 years U.S. policy was that nuclear deterrence (remember "mutual assured destruction"?) can be conducive to stability. Now U.S. policy is to tell Pakistan that a nuclear imbalance is crucial to stability in South Asia. Perhaps it is.

However, arms control is usually impossible until it is unimportant. Arms control agreements usually renounce superfluous weapons or accept limits higher than anticipated procurements. Nations will abide by only those arms limitation agreements that do not seriously inconvenience their pursuit of security and other national interests. As India's euphoria about the nuclear tests demonstrates, those interests can have a huge psychological component.

In "On the Origins of War," Donald Kagan, the Yale historian and classicist, notes that one current theory of war's obsolescence holds that free markets and the communications revolution have sublimated aggressive energies in commercial relations that are too valuable to disrupt by violence. But, Kagan notes, "over the past two centuries the only thing more common than predictions about the end of war has been war itself."

Remember, Kagan says, what Thucydides listed first among the three things that cause people to go to war: "honor, fear and interest." Liberal optimism about taming the world rests on the hope that fear can be assuaged and interests accommodated. But honor is a more volatile variable. Kagan says that if we understand the significance of honor to include deference, esteem, respect and prestige, it is an important motive of modern nations.

Honor, says Kagan, is desirable in itself and has practical importance in the competition for power, because a nation's honor and fame are apt to wax and wane reciprocally. Kagan believes that considerations of material gain or even ambition for power itself frequently play a small role in bringing on war, and that "often some aspect of honor is decisive." Which is one reason why threats of material losses from economic sanctions are weak enforcements of arms controls and will be utterly futile against an India feeling its oats.

Washington Post May 21, 1998 Pg. 27

Colombia's Chance For Peace

By Bernard Aronson

The United States soon will make a fateful decision about Colombia. We will either help launch an international peace process that could end that country's 30-year guerrilla war -- a war that last year claimed more than 6,000 lives. Or we will get deeply involved in prosecuting that war and risk allying ourselves with paramilitary forces that recently massacred 21 civilians, including a 4-year-old child, in a remote village in guerrilla-controlled territory.

The stakes for the hemisphere are high. Colombia -- South America's second-most populous country -- supplies 80 percent of the world's cocaine. It is also the only country in Latin America whose guerrilla armies are growing stronger. They now control more than one-third of the country. As the war expands, it risks spilling across the border into Venezuela, the No. 1 oil supplier to the United States.

Nevertheless, there are reasons for optimism. For the first time, a national consensus unites Colombian society in support of a negotiated settlement. A ballot initiative calling for negotiations gained the highest vote margin in Colombian electoral history. In recent weeks, also, leaders of the largest guerrilla army have sent messages to Washington that they support a negotiated settlement. The guerrillas offer -- as part of an overall political settlement -- to end all ties to drug trafficking and to cooperate in promoting alternative economic development for the peasants who grow coca leaf and poppy in the regions under guerrilla control.

Moreover, the candidate positioned to win Colombia's presidency in June is Andres Pastrana, who four years ago blew the whistle on secret drug cartel campaign contributions to the current president, Ernesto Samper. Pastrana narrowly lost to Samper in that election. If he defeats Samper's handpicked candidate, he will wield the moral and political authority necessary to garner international backing for a peace process and to negotiate credibly with the guerrillas. Even Fidel Castro, the original patron of the guerrillas, today privately claims to support negotiations.

There are also grave dangers. As Pastrana looks more like a sure winner, the drug traffickers may decide to assassinate him. In the 1990 presidential election, the cartels murdered the leading anti-drug candidate. Attention should be paid.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Congress and the administration are embroiled in an election-year argument about who is "soft" on Colombian narcotrafficking. Pressure is mounting on the administration to provide anti-insurgency training, intelligence and aid to help the beleaguered Colombian

army defeat the guerrillas in the name of fighting drug trafficking.

The army may need some short-term assistance following recent guerrilla victories. But the Colombian armed forces have not been able to defeat the guerrillas over three decades under eight different governments, and will not defeat them in the foreseeable future at any acceptable political and moral cost, regardless of U.S. assistance. The war is being waged, also, by irregular paramilitary forces -- some led by drug traffickers and smugglers -- which have massacred civilians accused of being guerrilla sympathizers. Allying with them would recall the worst days of El Salvador.

The war has fostered instability, violence and a weak government with little or no authority over much of the countryside. That is the sea in which the drug traffickers swim. Widening the war will not reduce drug trafficking. Ending the war through negotiations would allow Colombians for the first time to isolate the drug cartels and their corrupt political allies.

The guerrillas began as committed Marxist-Leninists and currently finance their operations through kidnappings, extortion of oil pipeline companies and protection money from drug traffickers. No strategy for peace in Colombia should romanticize them. But before we start down the slippery slope of counterinsurgency, the guerrillas' offer to cooperate in ending coca leaf production in their zones should be tested seriously.

As we saw in El Salvador, Guatemala, and now, perhaps, in Northern Ireland, there comes a time in the life of nations racked by bloody civil conflicts when the combatants grow weary of warfare, the larger society is pressing for peace, new political leaders emerge, and the chance to gain concrete reforms through negotiation brings all sides to the bargaining table. Such a moment may have come to Colombia.

A successful peace process in Colombia will require active involvement of the United Nations under the Security Council, including, eventually, deployment of peacekeepers. It also will require participation of nations in Latin America and Europe that have influence with all the parties, as well as substantial resources from the development banks and donor nations to help substitute legal crops for coca, finance reform of Colombian institutions and retrain former combatants. In the end, peace will depend foremost on Colombians. But now, as in the past, the leadership of the United States will be indispensable.

The writer was assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs from June 1989 to July 1993.

INSIDE THE RING

by Ernest Blazar

Washington Times
May 21, 1998
Pg. 21

Not gonna happen

Marine Commandant Gen. Chuck Krulak thinks Americans will never order women into direct combat.

"I just don't think the mothers and fathers of America will put up with it," he told a gathering of reporters yesterday morning. "It is not us, not the Army, not the Air Force, not the Navy, it's the American people. I don't think they will ever be prepared to send their daughters as the point on a Marine rifle squad."

Any doubts at all about that, sir?

"I think you can take that to the bank."

Burden of rank

Rank may have its privileges, soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines like to say. But it also has a downside. A new Pentagon report shows that instead of entry into a life of ease, promotion to general or admiral is mostly the start of nonstop misconduct investigations.

And it's not the admirals and generals doing the investigating. They're the ones under the microscope.

In the last 2½ years, the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines have launched 829 investigations into allegations of misconduct by some of their 1,424 active, reserve and National Guard generals and admirals.

That's more than one investigation for every two top military leaders.

Pentagon statistics show that about 92 percent of such cases eventually clear the general or admiral of any wrongdoing.

"We would love for all of our senior leaders to be pristine," a senior Army official told Inside the Ring yesterday. "But how realistic is that? Do they make mistakes like everyone else? You are damn right."

He says the report shows how seriously the Army and other services take claims of wrongdoing by top military men and women.

These figures were revealed to Congress a week ago in a Pentagon inspector general report.

The Senate Armed Services Committee called for the report last year because it was concerned that misconduct investigations take longer for National Guard officers than for their active-duty counterparts.

While the report to Congress confirmed the committee's suspicion, what is most startling is the scale of the Pentagon's routine effort to ferret out misbehavior in its senior-most military ranks.

For example, 15 of the nation's 54 Army and Air National Guard adjutants general — the heads of the state militias — are now under investigation.

Misconduct is any violation of military law or regulation. It can range from improper use of a car, plane or office supplies to more serious military crimes such as adultery, sexual harassment or retaliation. Even anonymous phone calls can trigger such an investigation (60 percent of anonymous charges prove true).

With such a low threshold to start an investigation, the large number of investigations should come as no surprise.

In the last 2½ years, the Army opened 451 investigations into accusations of various levels of misconduct by some of its 602 active, reserve and National Guard generals. As of December 1997, the last period for which figures are available, 169 of those cases remain open, 123 of which were dormant as backlog.

The Air Force opened 281 investigations into the conduct of many of its 464 active, reserve and Air National Guard generals since October 1995. Since last fall, all but 31 have been closed.

No fewer than 71 of the Navy's 268 active and reserve admirals came under scrutiny after the Navy Department received claims of misconduct since Oct. 1995. All but 11 were closed by last October.

Counting only 90 generals, the Marine Corps investigated 26 of its own during the same period. Four Marine generals are still under investigation.

The report contained no details on the several dozens of cases that have proved misconduct by top officers. Each of the four services routinely works hard to hide such cases from the public. Only if a report leaks is it then publicly commented upon by service officials.

Doing all this sleuthing are 52 full-time military and civilian Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps investigators, supervisors and support staff.

A charge that these folks drag their heels when investigating National Guard officers is what prompted the Senate to ask for study.

It found that inquiries into mis-

conduct by Army National Guard generals take 65 percent longer than similar probes of active-duty Army generals. The report concluded that the National Guard isn't a lower priority, but investigations of its generals are usually more complex, involving more charges.

For example, 25 percent of National Guard generals under investigation face five or more separate charges. Only 7 percent of active-duty Army generals under investigation face such multiple allegations.

Investigators think they know why.

Army National Guard officers "often serve together from 20 to 30 years. Such extended close association . . . can engender intense animosities" and provides time for would-be complainants to gather dirt on fellow guardsmen.

But that's not all. The report's authors took testimony from several investigators and generals who claim that "malcontents" are "gaming" the system. And it is a problem that plagues all the services, not just the National Guard.

Some dime-droppers know that every charge, even anonymous ones, must be investigated. Probes can take years, effectively delaying or even scuttling the promotion or change in jobs for a would-be general or admiral.

One witness quoted in the report said the Pentagon "shows no recognition that people out there have figured out how to play their system and they're using it for retribution."

Asked a senior Army official: "Isn't this reflective of society?".

• *Ernest Blazar can be reached at 703/486-3949 or by e-mail (blazar@twtmail.com)..*

The USS Scorpion: Mystery of the deep

Seattle Post-Intelligencer
May 21, 1998 Pg. 1

The Navy says the submarine's sinking was an accident; revelations suggest a darker scenario

Stories by Ed Offley
P-I MILITARY REPORTER

The nuclear submarine USS Scorpion got the top secret message shortly before midnight: Change course and head for the Canary Islands, where a mysterious collection of Soviet ships had caught the Navy's eye.

Thirty-three minutes later, the Scorpion surfaced at the U.S. submarine base in Rota, Spain, to transfer two crewmen ashore via a Navy tug. The men had emergency leave orders, one for a family matter, the other for medical reasons.

It was May 17, 1968, and it was the last time anyone saw the Scorpion. The submarine sank five days later.

More than five months later, the Scorpion's wreckage was found on the ocean floor, two miles deep in the Atlantic. All 99 men aboard had died.

Spokesman Cmdr. Frank Thorp on Tuesday repeated the Navy's position the Scorpion sank because of a malfunction while returning to its home port of Norfolk, Va. "While the precise cause of the loss remains undetermined, there is no information to support the theory that the submarine's loss resulted from hostile action or any involvement by a Soviet ship or submarine," Thorp said.

But in fact, the Scorpion at the time it sank was at the center of a web of espionage, high-tech surveillance and a possible Cold War military clash that resulted in an alleged agreement by both the United States and the former Soviet Union to cover up the full accounting of what happened.

A review of hundreds of documents and interviews with dozens of current and former military personnel presents a scenario dramatically different from the official Navy version:

■ The Scorpion was not on a routine crossing of the Atlantic, but had been diverted to a top-secret mission to spy on a group of Soviet ships, including a nuclear submarine.

■ Although the Navy's official explanation was of a mechanical malfunction, that countermanded an earlier conclusion by a panel of senior Navy officials that the Scorpion was sunk by a torpedo. The panel concluded it was one of the Scorpion's own torpedoes, gone awry. Experts still disagree about whether it could have been a Soviet torpedo.

■ The Scorpion believed it was operating in secret, but John Walker, the Navy's most notorious spy, had given the Soviets the codes they needed to track the U.S. submarine in the hours before it sank. The Soviets had the ability to monitor all electronic transmissions to the Scorpion, including the encrypted orders sending it on its spy mission.

■ Several Russian admirals say senior Navy officials in both the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to never disclose details of the Scorpion incident and the loss of a Soviet missile sub in the Pacific two months earlier in 1968. To do so, they say, could have seriously damaged U.S.-Soviet relations.

A senior admiral in the Pentagon at the time of the Scorpion sinking said in a recent interview that U.S. intelligence agencies feared the submarine was headed into possible danger, based on intercepted Soviet naval communications in the Atlantic.

"There was some communications analysis . . . that the Scorpion had been detected by the group she had been shadowing and conceivably they had trailed her," retired Vice Adm. Philip Beshany said. "There were some speculations that not only did they track her but attacked her."

Beshany at the time of the sinking was a rear admiral in charge of the Navy's submarine warfare programs and had access to the most critical intelligence data. However, Beshany said to his recollection the intelligence of Soviet hostility was never confirmed.

There is evidence that indirectly supports Beshany's assertion that the U.S. intelligence community learned of a possible confrontation between the Scorpion and the Soviet warships it had been sent to spy on.

The Navy mounted a secret search for the submarine within 24

hours of its sinking, several retired admirals told the Post-Intelligencer. The search was so highly classified that the rest of the Navy, and even a Navy Court of Inquiry that investigated the sinking later in 1968, were never told about it. Friends and relatives of the Scorpion crew were told nothing; they still assumed the sub was on its way home.

The deepest secret, however, was on the Soviet side.

No one in the U.S. Navy – including the top admirals who sent the Scorpion on its spy mission – knew at the time how deeply the Soviets had penetrated U.S. Navy submarine codes, thanks to Navy Warrant Officer Walker, the man behind the worst espionage scandal in Navy history, one that may have resulted in the sinking of the Scorpion.

Thorp declined comment on the Walker spy connection.

The mission

Commissioned in 1959, the Scorpion was designed primarily for anti-submarine warfare against the Soviet nuclear sub fleet. It also carried special teams of Russian-speaking linguists to eavesdrop on transmissions by the Soviet Navy and other military units.

Its final mission began on May 17, 1968.

Led by Cmdr. Francis Slattery, the Scorpion had just completed a three-month deployment to the Mediterranean Sea with the U.S. 6th Fleet and was on its way home to Norfolk, Va., when an encrypted order clattered out of a teletypewriter in the sub's small radio room.

Vice Adm. Arnold Schade, commander of the Atlantic Submarine Force in Norfolk, had a new mission for the Scorpion.

The sub was ordered to head at high speed toward the Canary Islands, 1,500 miles away off the east coast of Africa, to spy on a group of Soviet ships lurking in the eastern Atlantic southwest of the island chain.

The Soviet ships there included an Echo II-class nuclear submarine designed to attack aircraft carriers but also armed with anti-submarine torpedoes.

For the next five days, the Scorpion sprinted toward its target.

What happened when the Scorpion arrived there remains a Cold War secret.

The Navy has never given an official explanation of its keen interest in the Soviet ship activity, and the Court of Inquiry that investigated the loss of the Scorpion in the summer and fall of 1968 said nothing about the sub's spy mission against the Soviet ships.

The court described the Soviet presence as an undefined "hydro-acoustic" research operation involving two research vessels and a submarine rescue ship among others, implying the Soviets were merely conducting studies of sound effects in the ocean rather than a military mission.

But Beshany, the director of submarine warfare at the time, said in a recent interview that Pentagon officials had been concerned the Soviets were developing a way to support warships and submarines at sea without requiring access to foreign seaports for supplies.

"This was absolutely something totally different (from normal Soviet procedures)," Beshany said. Until that time, the Soviet Navy had rarely conducted prolonged operations at sea far from home ports, he noted.

Beshany's Pentagon assistant at the time of the sinking, Capt. W.N. "Buck" Dietzen, backed that up in a recent interview.

"We recognized the high desirability of getting . . . over there and taking a look at them (the Soviets)," Dietzen said. "I was salivating in the (Pentagon) corridors to find out what they were doing."

The Navy has yet to declassify details of the Scorpion surveillance mission.

The Navy said in 1968 that Schade sent a message to the Scorpion on May 20 assigning the sub a course and speed for its homeward trip once the surveillance mission ended.

Just after 3 a.m. on May 22 – the day the Scorpion sank – Cmdr. Slattery finished transmitting a message to Schade that the Scorpion would arrive in Norfolk on May 27 at 1 p.m., Navy officials said in 1968. Later in 1968, after revealing only that the sub had been on a "mission of higher classification" before it sank, Navy officials said Slattery had reported his mission ended and was heading home.

The texts of both messages are still classified top secret.

But was the Scorpion's mission actually over?

One Navy officer at a key location in 1968 has contradicted the account the Navy gave that year that the submarine was nowhere near the Soviets at the time it was lost.

Lt. John Rogers, a Navy communications officer working at the Atlantic Submarine Force headquarters message center in Norfolk in 1968, was the duty officer the night Slattery's last message arrived.

Rogers said in a 1986 interview with author Pete Earley that Slattery had actually announced he was about to begin the surveillance of the Soviets, rather than reporting the mission's completion. Rogers died in 1995, but his widow, Bernice Rogers, confirmed in a recent interview that her husband had told her the Scorpion had disappeared while actually carrying out the surveillance mission against the Soviets.

"My husband was at the (submarine force) message center as communications officer the night that message came in," Bernice Rogers said. "He would have known what was going on. We had talked about it since then."

What is known is that fifteen hours after sending its final message, the Scorpion exploded at 6:44 p.m. and sank in more than 2 miles of water about 400 miles southwest of the Azores.

What brought the Scorpion down?

For nearly three decades, the Navy said it could not identify the "certain cause" of the loss of the Scorpion and refused to release the conclusions of the Court of Inquiry, citing security concerns and Cold War tensions. The seven-man court of high-ranking naval officers held hearings during the summer and late fall of 1968, and in January 1969 completed its report, which was kept classified for 24 years.

In late 1993, the Navy declassified most of the court's conclusions. Headed by retired Vice Adm. Bernard Austin, the Scorpion court concluded that the best evidence pointed to an errant Scorpion torpedo that circled around and exploded against the hull of the sub. The court's conclusion stemmed in part from records showing the Scorpion had had a similar experience in 1967 with an unarmed training torpedo that suddenly started up and had to be jettisoned.

The court in its investigation reviewed photographs of the wreckage, the sound recordings of the sinking, and the detailed paper trail of records, including documents and reports mailed from the sub during the early part of its Mediterranean operation.

In its final 1,354-page report, the Court of Inquiry rejected two alternative theories for the loss of the Scorpion: the contention by Schade and his staff that an unspecified mechanical problem had set off a chain of events leading to massive flooding inside the submarine, and a scenario that an explosion inside the submarine touched off the sinking.

The court also concluded that it was "improbble" the Scorpion sank as the result of "enemy action."

In 1970, a different Navy panel completed another classified report that disavowed the Court of Inquiry's conclusion. Instead of an accidental torpedo strike, the new group suggested a mechanical failure caused an irreparable leak that flooded the submarine.

That report said the bulk of the evidence suggested an internal explosion in the sub's massive electrical battery caused the sub to flood and sink.

However, two senior Navy officials involved in the initial Scorpion probe in the summer of 1968 told the Post-Intelligencer that the Court of Inquiry conclusion of an accidental torpedo strike remains the most realistic scenario because of the key acoustic

recordings of the sinking.

Underwater recordings retrieved from three locations in the Atlantic – the Canary Islands and two sites near Newfoundland _ captured a single sharp noise followed by 91 seconds of silence, then a rapid series of sounds corresponding to the overall collapse of the submarine's various compartments and tanks.

John Craven, then a senior civilian Navy scientist and expert on underwater technology who led the team that found the Scorpion wreckage, said the acoustic evidence all but proves a torpedo explosion – rather than a hull collapse from flooding – sank the Scorpion and killed the 99 men inside.

"Once the hull implodes the other compartments are going to follow right along" in collapsing, Craven said. "There's no way you can have the hull implode and then have 91 seconds of silence while the rest of the hull decides to try and hang itself together."

Retired Adm. Bernard Clarey, who in 1968 was the Navy's senior submariner, also dismissed the battery explosion theory. Such a mishap could not have generated the blast and acoustic energy captured on the hydrophone recordings, he told the Post-Intelligencer. Both Craven and Clarey said in interviews the evidence supports the theory that one of the Scorpion's own torpedoes exploded inside the sub.

While several retired submariners over the years have speculated the Scorpion was ambushed and sunk by a Soviet submarine, no conclusive proof of a deliberate attack has appeared. The Navy concluded in the 1968 investigation there was "no evidence of any Soviet preparations for hostilities or a crisis situation as would be expected in the event of a premeditated attack on Scorpion."

The Court of Inquiry report was silent on whether an inadvertent clash may have resulted in the sinking.

Thorp, the Navy spokesman, said the Court had found the Scorpion was 200 miles away from the Soviet ships at the time it sank.

The loss of the Scorpion 30 years ago remains a mystery to family members and friends of the crew. But it may not have been a mystery to a handful of senior U.S. and Soviet Navy leaders in the late 1960s.

The Post-Intelligencer has learned that the United States and Soviet Union secretly agreed decades ago to bury the facts about the Scorpion loss and a separate Soviet submarine tragedy that also occurred in 1968.

Two months before the Scorpion sank, a Soviet missile sub known as the K-129 sank thousands of miles away, in the Pacific Ocean, also under mysterious conditions. There have been assertions by Russian submarine veterans over the years that the K-129 sank after colliding with a U.S. attack sub that been trailing it. But U.S. military officials insist the Golf-class submarine went down with its 98-man crew after an internal explosion, based on analysis of the sounds of the sinking captured on Navy hydrophones.

Retired Capt. Peter Huchthausen was the U.S. Naval attache in Moscow in the late 1980s, two decades after both incidents. Breaking his silence for the first time, Huchthausen told the Post-Intelligencer he had several terse but pointed conversations with Soviet admirals about the two sinkings.

One was in June 1987 with Admiral Pitr Navoytsev, first deputy chief for operations of the Soviet Navy. When he asked Navoytsev about the Scorpion, Huchthausen recalls this response:

"Captain, you are very young and inexperienced, but you will learn that there are some things both sides have agreed not to address, and one is that event and our K-129 loss, for similar reasons."

In another discussion in October 1989, Huchthausen said Vice Adm. B.M. Kamarov told him that a secret agreement had been reached between the United States and Soviet Union in which both sides agreed not to press the other government on the loss of their submarines in 1968. The motivation, Huchthausen said, was to preserve the thaw in superpower relations. A full accounting of either submarine loss might create new tensions, he said.

"He (Komarov) said the submariners involved and those few in the know on both sides were sworn, with the threat of maximum punishment, never to divulge the operational background of either incident," Huchthausen said.

And in 1995, after Huchthausen had retired and was working on a book on Soviet submarines, he interviewed retired Rear Adm. Viktor Dygalo, the former commander of the submarine division to which the K-129 was assigned.

Dygalo told him the true story of the K-129 will never be known because of an unofficial agreement by senior submariners on both sides to freeze any further investigation of involvement of either side in the losses of the Scorpion or the K-129.

And he told Huchthausen this:

"So forget about ever resolving these sad issues for the surviving families."

Omaha World-Herald May 20, 1998 Pg. 3

Admiral Sees Strain On Navy

Top Officer Visits Offutt, StratCom

By Jason Gertzen

The nation's top admiral said Tuesday that the Navy is feeling the strain from being forced to keep open more bases than it needs.

"This is a serious matter for us," Adm. Jay Johnson said at Offutt Air Force Base. "We need relief."

Johnson, the chief of naval operations, visited Offutt this week to meet with senior officials at the U.S. Strategic Command. StratCom is responsible for planning, targeting and, during a war, commanding the nation's long range nuclear forces.

Johnson, who became the Navy's top officer in 1996, said he endorses calls from Defense Secretary William Cohen and the other service chiefs for a new round of military base closings.

"We are carrying too much infrastructure in the United States Navy," Johnson said. "It's a fact."

He said the Navy would use the savings from the base closings to spend more on its combat forces.

The Navy's tight budget has not led to shortchanging its sailors and ships, Johnson said.

"I can assure you and everyone that the tip-of-the-spear readiness of the United States Navy is exactly where it needs to be," he said. "We can execute. We are ready. It's what we do."

The problems are being felt at home by the sailors when they return from missions, he said. "If the Navy suffers any readiness erosion, that's where it will show itself first."

Johnson said he has tried to reshape the Navy by trimming some areas to provide more money for additional manpower, maintenance and military operations.

Like the Air Force, the Navy faces a serious problem keeping its pilots and other key members in uniform.

The Navy's retention problems are not yet as severe as the Air Force's, and Johnson said he is optimistic about resolving them before they get as bad.

Johnson said the Navy is prepared to continue providing StratCom with the 18 ballistic missile submarines that it requires.

"That is the right number for us," Johnson said. "We are resourcing them properly. We have the best crews in the world, and I don't see that changing."

The submarine force making its regular patrols helps send the message to potential foes that the United States is ready to respond immediately to an attack, he said.

"Our Navy, I believe, plays a fundamental role in stability around the world by being there. It helps create an atmosphere of stability. There is no substitute for being there."

India's recent nuclear testing has raised the prospects of a nuclear arms race involving Pakistan.

"I'm troubled by what happened in India," Johnson said. "I certainly hope calm will prevail and we don't get into some sort of escalation."

Wall Street Journal May 20, 1998 New Eng. 1

Navy Yard And Electric Boat Seek Alliance In Tight Times

By Jeffrey Krasner
and Caleb Solomon
Staff Reporters of The
Wall Street Journal

In an unprecedented effort to keep submarine facilities alive in New England, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is looking to consolidate some of its activities with a private-sector shipyard, Electric Boat

Corp.

An agreement signed April 17 by Captain Vernon Williams, commander of the Naval shipyard, and John Welch, president of Electric Boat, creates a joint working group that will pursue "a public-private partnership" to pare duplicate functions.

"The goal of this initiative," says a Navy spokeswoman, "is to reduce the cost of submarine maintenance."

While it is far from certain whether the nascent relationship will ever result in a combination, job cuts would almost certainly be a part of any consolidation. And that has some politicians and union officials wary. But the broader aim is to prevent the closing of the facilities altogether.

New Era

In political, business and military circles, it's widely felt that even the half-dozen or so submarine facilities still operating in the U.S. are far too many for the post-Cold War era. And some people have questioned the need in New England for both the Portsmouth yard, located on an island on the Maine-New Hampshire border, and Electric Boat, just a three-hour drive away in Groton, Conn.

"There's too much capacity, and it really needs to be pruned," says James McCaul, president of International Maritime Associates Inc., a Washington, D.C., management-consulting firm specializing in shipping. "There are just too many facilities, and the work is being spread out and as a result, no one's real happy -- and more important, nobody is real healthy."

A combination between the Portsmouth shipyard and Electric Boat "makes a lot of sense," Mr. McCaul says.

An Electric Boat spokesman says the working-group agreement is "preliminary" and referred questions to the Navy.

Though the Navy has been pushing to privatize some facilities to reduce its repair-and-maintenance budget, a military base linking with a private company the way Portsmouth and Electric Boat are contemplating "has never happened before," says Mr. McCaul. "I can't think of anything that would come close."

Often rivals for maintenance work over the years, both Electric Boat and the Portsmouth shipyard are far and away the largest employers in their areas and among the largest in each state. The jobs generally are high-paying. But both yards have been hard hit by the end of the Cold War and continued defense cutbacks.

A subsidiary of General Dynamics Corp., Electric Boat is known mostly for building submarines. It has seen employment plunge to 9,600 workers at the end of last year from 24,000 in 1987. These layoffs have already devastated the area's economy. And additional cuts are expected by year's end.

The Portsmouth shipyard, a repair and maintenance facility for submarines with 3,300 civilian workers, has gone through several layoffs in past years, which have cut its civilian work force from about 8,500 in 1989. It has survived four rounds of base closings by the Department of Defense, in large part because of its activist employees, who have appealed loudly to their Congressional delegation.

"In Maine and New Hampshire, we spend a fair bit of time working with the Navy to make sure there's a flow of work [at Portsmouth] to keep workers employed," says Rep. Thomas Allen (D., Maine). "The figures show a steady workload through 2003."

Defensive Posture

Any threat to the remaining jobs because of privatization efforts "would provoke a tremendous response" from congressmen and women representing the two states, Mr. Allen says.

Some union officials at Portsmouth say shipyard officials have briefed them on the Electric Boat agreement, but not in detail. George Benner, president of the Metal Trades Council, which includes 11 unions representing about 2,500 Portsmouth workers, says he would fight any effort to take work away from his members. "We're viewing this as giving away our work," Mr. Benner says. "Just like any company, we do not like to see our work given to any other company, especially private industry."

Mr. Benner also questions whether there is any duplication of functions between the shipyard and Electric Boat. "We are into repairing mainly subs," he says, "and they're into new construction. I don't see that as duplication." But he adds, "If the Navy can show us a win-win situation, then certainly we'd be interested."

Part of the shipyards' pact calls for them to look into "partnering in submarine maintenance work" at a Navy submarine base in New London, Conn., which is very close to Electric Boat's Groton facilities.

Currently, workers from Portsmouth occasionally must travel to the Naval base -- about three hours each way -- to perform short-term maintenance and repair work on the vessels. Given the jobs cuts over the past few years, Portsmouth workers make the trip, but many don't like it. "We'd much rather work at the yard," says Mr. Benner. So the joint working group will examine whether it would be more efficient for Electric Boat to do all or some of the New London work.

Until a few years ago, Electric Boat competed with Portsmouth to win bids on smaller submarine-maintenance jobs. But the Navy began directing that work to the public shipyards. Military experts say Electric Boat workers still retain those skills, and that a shipyard that can build a submarine can also perform repairs.

Looming Cuts

Pressure continues to mount for military bases to cut costs. Last month the Pentagon released a study showing that the base closings since 1988 have saved a total of $14 billion. About 100 military posts have been closed. But the report concludes that there is excess capacity in 20% of the remaining 400 military bases.

The Navy had already been pushing its contractors, and its own facilities, to cut costs. Last year, with prodding from the Navy, Electric Boat reached an agreement to build four attack submarines in a joint venture with its bitter rival, Newport News Shipbuilding Inc. of Virginia. The agreement is expected to save the Defense Department millions of dollars.

And Portsmouth itself has been seeking other ways to redefine its role. The shipyard is looking to lease underutilized facilities to private companies. A spokeswoman says the shipyard is in the early stages of identifying poorly used or excess facilities. If the Navy approves, the shipyard will solicit proposals from companies interested in the buildings or equipment.

Mr. Benner, the union official, says he has fewer reservations about leasing out facilities than combining work with Electric Boat. "You're talking facilities, not Department of Defense work," he says.

Sacramento Bee May 19, 1998 Pg. B3

Defense Official Defends Move To Shift Lathrop Jobs

By Jim Miller
Bee Washington Bureau

Calling it the right move for the military and U.S. taxpayers, the Pentagon's No. 3 official Monday upheld the Defense Department's decision last fall to put a consolidated depot command in Pennsylvania instead of San Joaquin County.

The announcement means the new Defense Distribution Center in New Cumberland, Pa., is there to stay, and that the layoff of more than 500 white-collar employees at Lathrop-based Defense Distribution Region West will continue.

In a letter to the General Accounting Office, Jacques S. Gansler, undersecretary of defense for acquisition and technology, wrote he is "fully satisfied" the selection process was "fair and proper." Additionally, Gansler said, reversing course now would hurt the military.

The GAO, a congressional watchdog agency, in February said there were problems with how the military had reached its decision.

Reps. Richard Pombo, R-Tracy, and Gary Condit, D-

Ceres, who for more than a year have criticized the Defense Logistics Agency's intentions and who had demanded the GAO investigation last fall, said they were disappointed by Gansler's decision.

"The Defense Logistics Agency dragged out this review process until it was too far along to change or reverse," Pombo said in a statement. "I am very disappointed with the Department of Defense's decision and strongly disagree with their conclusion."

There are 22 equipment supply depots for the U.S. military. Until last year, two regional commands oversaw the depots' operations. In spring 1997, the Defense Logistics Agency said it would merge the commands into a single Defense Distribution Center, to be put in either San Joaquin County or New Cumberland, the site of Defense Distribution Region East.

In September, the logistics agency said New Cumberland would get the distribution center. According to the agency, nearly three-quarters of the consolidation has already taken place. Employee representatives argued the consolidation process is not as far along as defense officials say it is.

In its February report, the GAO said the logistics agency seemed to have made major errors during the selection process, which relied on a point system that aimed to measure equipment and operational expenses at the two commands.

Defense officials responded to the GAO report last month: They denied any errors were made, but said the department would review its decision all the same. That's what Gansler did.

For Pombo and Condit, Monday's announcement effectively ends their crusade to reverse the September decision.

The cuts at Defense Distribution Region West will affect analysts, administrators, public affairs personnel and other regional employees. An additional 326 regional command employees whose jobs relate to Defense Distribution San Joaquin -- composed of the sister defense depots in Tracy and Lathrop -- will keep their jobs.

None of the more than 1,600 positions at the Tracy and Lathrop depots will be eliminated, although regional command employees with seniority and qualifications can bump a depot employee for a job.

Washington Post May 21, 1998 Pg. D1

Foreign Firms Are Looking at Northrop

Firm Says It's Set On Lockheed Deal

By Tim Smart
Washington Post
Staff Writer

Two foreign defense companies appear interested in acquiring Northrop Grumman Corp. if the Justice Department succeeds in blocking Lockheed Martin Corp.'s proposed $12 billion purchase of Northrop.

The chief executive of Daimler-Benz Aerospace AG, Manfred Bischoff, told the Wall Street Journal Europe this week at the Berlin Air Show that he has spoken with executives of two British aerospace companies about a possible joint bid for parts of Northrop Grumman. Bischoff could not be reached for comment yesterday.

Bischoff's remarks came a month after the head of Britain's GEC PLC expressed interest in acquiring parts of Northrop Grumman if Bethesda-based Lockheed Martin must divest Northrop units to gain government approval of its proposed takeover.

Any purchase of a U.S. defense company would be scrutinized by the Pentagon and Congress. When a foreign purchaser attempts to buy a U.S. company that handles a significant amount of classified work, as Northrop Grumman does, the matter is reviewed by an interagency group and the final decision is made by the president. In 1992, French defense company Thomson CSF tried to buy LTV Corp.'s missile business but withdrew after heavy opposition in Congress.

Northrop spokesman Jim Taft said he would not comment on possible entreaties from European aerospace concerns. "We remain committed to completing our merger with Lockheed Martin," he said.

But in recent weeks Northrop chief executive Kent Kresa Jr. has told Wall Street analysts that the company could remain independent and will try to grow through acquisitions if Lockheed loses its court battle with the Justice Department. Over the past few years, Kresa has built Northrop into a $9 billion company by purchasing Grumman Corp. and Westinghouse Electric Corp.'s defense business.

A spokesman for GEC, which recently announced plans to acquire Texas defense contractor Tracor Inc. in a $1.4 billion deal, also would not comment except to say the company is interested in increasing its global presence. The other British company that might join in a bid for Northrop, British Aerospace PLC, already is a partner with Lockheed Martin in the competition for the Joint Strike Fighter contract.

Wolfgang Demisch, a defense industry analyst at BT Alex. Brown Inc., said he doubted the Europeans could muster a bid for Northrop, as he estimated it would sell for more than $10 billion.

"Daimler has a little chewing phase ahead of them," he said, referring to the parent company's proposed $41 billion merger with Chrysler Corp. "I don't think GEC has $10 billion lying around."

Interest in pieces of Northrop Grumman from European buyers could put pressure on the California company to seek another merger partner if Justice is successful in blocking the Lockheed Martin deal. The government filed suit on March 23, saying Lockheed Martin's purchase of Northrop would reduce competition in the U.S. defense industry and lead to higher prices for weapons systems bought by the Pentagon. Lockheed is fighting Justice in federal court.

Government officials have expressed the most concern about the possibility of Lockheed gaining control of Northrop Grumman's radar and defense electronics businesses. But Northrop also is a major supplier of commercial aerospace products to Boeing Co., which competes directly against the European aircraft consortium Airbus Industrie. Its members include Daimler-Benz Aerospace and British Aerospace.

An aerospace executive who did not want to be identified expressed doubt that the U.S. government would allow some of Northrop Grumman's most important units, including a Linthicum, Md., division that makes radars for the Air Force's most advanced planes, to be acquired by foreign companies.

"Obviously, the Euros would be interested in expanding their presence in the U.S.," the executive said.

"But my own feeling is I would be surprised if the U.S. government allowed it."

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON , WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski **NEWS DIRECTOR:** Taft Phoebus **EARLY BIRD EDITOR**: Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe **ADMINISTRATION:** Wendy Powers **PRODUCTION:** Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)